DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 120 731 95 CS 202 584

AUTHOR	Lundsteen, Sara W., Ed.
TITLE	Help for the Teacher of Written Composition (K-9): New Directions in Research.
INSTITUTION	ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills, Urbana, Ill.; National Conference on Research in English.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Dissemination and Resources Group.
PUB DATE	76
CONTRACT	400-75-0029
NOTE	77p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Council of Teachers of English, 1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, Illinois 61801 (Stock No. 20644, $3.95 nonmember, $3.75 member)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	Child Language; *Composition (Literary); *Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; Literature Appreciation; *Literature Reviews; Motivation; Teaching Techniques

ABSTRACT

Children's abilities in written composition have recently become a major concern, stimulated by the National Assessment of Educational Progress, by the earmarking of composing ability as a new class marker, and by increased competition in an overcrowded labor market. This bulletin has been designed to help close the gap between educational research and the classroom teaching of written composition. Topics discussed include research, children's language and composition, motivation, the interrelationship of literature and composition, evaluation, and research perspectives from the behavioral sciences. Authors are Alvina Treut Burrows, James Fleming, Sara Lundsteen, Eileen Tway, and Robert Calfee. Although the scope of the bulletin is kindergarten through junior high, with emphasis on the elementary level, discussions of important research above this level are included. (JM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED120731

Help for the Teacher of Written Composition*

New Directions in Research

By a Committee of the
National Conference on Research in English

Sara W. Lundsteen, Editor
University of California, Irvine
California State University, Long Beach

Alvina Treut Burrows
Professor Emeritus
New York University

Robert C. Calfee
Stanford University

James T. Fleming
State University of New York at Albany

Eileen Tway
Miami University, Oxford, Ohio

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CS 202 584

National Conference on Research in English

ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills
1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, Illinois 61801

*K-9

NCRE Publications Board

William D. Page, University of Chicago, Chairperson
P. David Allen, University of Missouri at Kansas City
Rebecca Barr, University of Chicago
Sidney Bergquist, Northwestern University
John Bormuth, University of Chicago
Alvina Treut Burrows, Professor Emeritus, New York University
Earl D. Clark, Northern Illinois University
Robert Emans, University of Maryland
Donald Graves, University of New Hampshire
Earl Hansen, Northern Illinois University
Richard Hodges, University of Puget Sound
Marjorie Sedden Johnson, Temple University
Sara Lundsteen, University of California, Irvine
Coleman Morrison, Temple University
Helen K. Smith, University of Miami, Coral Gables

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number LC 76-10055
Published May 1976

National Conference on Research in English

ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills
1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, Illinois 61801

Printed in the United States of America

The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the National Conference on Research in English for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either the National Conference on Research in English or the National Institute of Education.

Designer: Rob Carter

Contents

Foreword		vii
Chapter 1	Research into Practice	1
Chapter 2	Research Then and Now	7
Chapter 3	Review of Development in Children's Language and Composition	16
Chapter 4	Is Outer Stimulation a Route to Inner Motivation?	29
Chapter 5	The Interrelationship of Literature and Composition	44
Chapter 6	The Challenge of Evaluation	52
Chapter 7	Research Perspectives from the Behavioral Sciences: Some New (And Not So New) Directions	62
Appendixes		67

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to extend our appreciation to the many NCRE members who sent us abstracts of studies on research in composition. Special thanks go to James E. Day of the English Department at California State University, Long Beach, who read the manuscript and offered a number of helpful suggestions. The authors would also like to thank Bernard O'Donnell, Director of ERIC/RCS, for his direction and encouragement during the planning and writing stages, and Linda Reed, ERIC/RCS Coordinator of Publications, who expertly guided the bulletin through the editing and production stages.

SWL

Foreword

In recent years children's ability to compose has become a major national, state, and local concern, stimulated by the National Assessment in Educational Progress, by the earmarking of composing ability as a new class marker, and by increased competition in an overcrowded labor market.

The very nature of this bulletin makes it especially appropriate that it should be published by the National Conference on Research in English in cooperation with the ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills. ERIC/RCS information analysis products are designed to close the gap between educational research and classroom teaching and are prepared in response to a directive from the National Institute of Education (NIE) that ERIC provide educators with opportunities for knowledge utilization beyond that provided by the ERIC data base.

In each information analysis paper, the author attempts a comprehensive treatment and qualitative assessment of the topic; tries to answer the question, "Where are we?"; sometimes finds order in disparate approaches; often points in new directions. The knowledge contained in an information analysis paper is a necessary foundation for reviewing existing curricula, planning new beginnings, and aiding teachers in now situations.

This bulletin has been written by a number of distinguished authorities in the field of written composition. The first two chapters were written by Alvina Treut Burrows; the third, by James Fleming; the fourth, by Alvina Treut Burrows and Sara Lundsteen; the fifth and sixth, by Eileen Tway; and the seventh, by Robert Calfee. All of the authors read and reacted to the outlines and manuscripts of the other authors and offered their own ideas and suggestions.

Although the scope of this bulletin is limited to kindergarten through junior high school, with major emphasis on the elementary school level, the ideas from research on composition are of universal interest. Studies done at any level must have ramifications for teaching at each of the other levels. For this reason, the authors did not hesitate to discuss important research done above the elementary level.

Bernard O'Donnell
Director, ERIC/RCS

1 Research into Practice

The lyf so short, the craft so long to lerne.
Chaucer (On the Work of Writing)

The lag of twenty-five to thirty-five years between the discovery of new knowledge and putting that knowledge into action is cause for regret. So long an interval is particularly wasteful in this day of rapid dissemination of information. Often changes in school practice are stalled because sufficient evidence to support change is not available or because diverse opinions or confusion over contradicting theories exist. Therefore, during this historic bicentennial decade, as we assess progress of many kinds, it seems timely to bring together the outstanding research conclusions of the last half century and the knowledge of outstanding leaders in the teaching of the language arts.

This has been done here in the form of twelve points which could stand as a platform upon which to build programs for children and young people. Some of the points derive from rigorous research; some come from the considered beliefs of eighteen nationally known leaders in language arts teaching and research (Robinson & Burrows, 1974). Although it is true that these twelve points are not new, in many schools they need the fortification that qualified opinion and "hard data" can give. Such genuine evidence can often overcome pressures of time, administrative restrictions, and cycles of action and reaction.

For some years to come, perhaps for several decades, the basic principles presented here can serve teachers, learners, and researchers. Until new data are available, this body of knowledge derived from both research and observation can give confidence to searching teachers and responsible leaders.

Twelve Points

1. *Oral language base.* Written composition needs to be tied to oral language. Conversation and "free talk" are the basis for consciously

structured reporting, story telling and retelling, both original and from other sources. The confidence and fluency that stem from composing with spoken words and body language is essentially related to composing with written words. Dramatics and pantomime add other dimensions to the composing process and promote vividness of characterization and economy of action, as well as clearer conceptualization of plot and episode. Partnerships in writing spring almost spontaneously from person-to-person talk and from dramatization, whether spontaneous or planned.

No doubt the most obvious and helpful link between oral language and written composing involves dictation by a child to a teacher who puts the child's spoken words into visible written form. Whether done on an individual or a group basis, hearing and seeing one's unique combination of words—whether a question or phrase, picture caption or whole sentence—is an exhilarating experience. This method also introduces children to the concept that written symbols stand for oral symbols. Gradual growth from dictation to shared writing to independent writing seems a natural sequence for a great majority of ready young learners.

2. *Environment.* A varied environment that stimulates many kinds of creative response adds depth and increases potential for selection of content. Experiences with music, dance, paint, clay, drama, rhythmic expression, and other media foster zest for experiment and inventiveness in the whole realm of curriculum—*including writing.* Writing grows out of experience. We need to spend more time on what happens before a child writes.

3. *Inner motivation.* Motivation to communicate comes from within. It is innate. Shared by humans of every culture, and apparently by some lower mammals, this urge is universal. For humans, writing is part of the urge. Oral languages historically advance into written forms; roughly 2000 of the more than 3000 oral languages now in existence have gradually developed to the point that they have written forms.

Teachers cannot "motivate" children to write; they can only stimulate them. When actually used to relate to peers and adults, children's writing is a vehicle both for self-expression and for affecting their audience. In almost any setting, children's unassigned writing exceeds their writing on assigned topics. Individual selection is not only possible but requisite, even when part of a cooperative authorship of books or letters or reports. Composing in writing is an intensely individual process. The individual writing conference between teacher and child may assist this process.

4. *The contribution of children's literature.* Children's literature can contribute greatly to the written and oral composing of children. Awareness in children of what a story is grows from early exposure to stories heard and read. From the earliest here-and-now accounts of objects and events shared with infants and toddlers, through the "safer" folk tales and (at somewhat later ages) tales made of sterner stuff, through imaginative and realistic literature, the oral and written heritage is a vast resource for children to draw upon in their own composing. Using known characters for new exploits can help many children to be truly original; for example, a popular dilemma from literature children often use is that of being the youngest or weakest, yet being able to achieve or overcome.

5. *Audience.* Various audiences help to shape the style and content of writing. Stories written for younger friends or classes have characteristics quite different from those written for older students or adults. This adaptation of writing style for different audiences holds whether the writing is factual, imaginative, speculative, or persuasive. And, since the product belongs to the producer, a story, poem, or any other writing should not be given to an audience until the young author releases it to that audience.

6. *Positive response.* Enjoyment of stories and reports, appreciation for a bit of original phrasing or a unique character or event, is the response to be encouraged. This reaction is positive and yet selective. Rating and grading have no part in unifying writer and audience. Appreciation of factual accuracy and questions reflecting a new curiosity awakened by a report show that an author has respected and affected his or her audience. Such positive reaction from teacher and peers is evaluative and is the kind of stimulus that builds motivation for further writing. Teachers help children by looking for strengths and pointing them out.

Negative criticism should be avoided because it implies rejection. Red-penciled correction and authoritarian comment can thwart the confidence needed for further exploration. Editing *with* a child when a paper is to be put into "good" form for display or in a permanent collection can and must be a supportive relationship. The purpose of editing is to help young authors say what they want to say. Even another child serving as editor can adopt a sharing attitude for the purpose of making the writing clear, precise, and easy to understand. If serious reshaping of a sequence of ideas is needed, this should be done on a separate paper. Respect for children's own words is thus maintained, and planning or accepting of a better approach is less likely to damage self-esteem.

7. *Drafts.* Children's first drafts are usually messy. Words are omitted or spelled wrong; handwriting is often poor. This is also true of many adult authors. One of the truisms of composing is that ideas forging ahead of one's pencil or typewriter cause many surface errors.

8. *Oral display.* Not every piece of writing needs to be corrected or copied. Much of a child's writing is best read aloud, if the child permits, and filed in a private folder. An audience might be large or it might be as small as one peer or one teacher. If the story, verse, letter, or report is to be read by persons other than the teacher-intermediary, then editing and writing in appropriate form are usually necessary. Seeking the author's approval for the finished copy helps to build pride, a strong force for further interest in writing.

9. *Developmental irregularity.* Development in writing occurs in irregular spurts. Although learning curves may appear when exact test scores are smoothed into a growth picture, such ratings are neither accurate nor appropriate for compositions. Not every story or other piece of writing is better than the preceding one for a child or for a professional. Teaching needs to be based on developmental knowledge of children's composition.

10. *Observation.* Developing powers of observation is essential to the writing process. Welcoming oral comment upon observations strengthens abilities needed in composing—for example, how the sand looks or feels when it blows, how birds fold their wings when they alight, why people prefer to be in groups rather than alone, or how an author makes an idea clear.

11. *Voice.* As children mature in supportive environments, they develop an individual "voice." They must be helped to understand who they are (in positive terms) and what values they stand for in order to develop their own style and project their creativity into their products.

12. *Creative problem-solving.* Creative problem-solving, an important part of composition, can strengthen essential processes of selection. The word *creative* implies child autonomy, child choice, some areas of the unknown, not just being handed a writing task, topic, or problem. Teachers, of course, can provide frameworks for writing problems ("Why don't you try composing a tall tale, something like those we've been reading and talking about."), but the substance of the composition needs to come from the child's own observation and imagination.

A teacher who feels that he or she *must* select the writing problem also must see the need to transfer the writing problem to the child's own valuing. Then a child sees the task as his or her concern, too. For example, unless the teacher can get the child *excited* about making imagined entries in a diary for a character (e.g., Laura in Wilder's *Little House on the Prairie*), then little of value will happen as the child writes.

The selective processes in creative problem-solving parallel some of the composing processes. Some parallels include the gathering and selection of details (observations or facts), the planning and selection of procedures, and the planning and selection of ways to evaluate the results, or consequences ("Did my 'funny' story make the group laugh?").

In essence, children can apply what they know about productive problem-solving to composing in writing. They need that same quality of creative autonomy and that same selectivity that they have used before on unknown, undecided, and unmastered areas (Golub, 1967; Lundsteen, 1976a, 1976b).

It is evident that different categorizations of principles could be derived from the wealth of experience, thoughtful observation, and research on composition that has accumulated in the last half century. Likewise, more principles could be distilled from the reservoir using the same process that has led to those here enunciated. Yet, the points noted above seem to be a healthful and manageable array of findings and adaptations. Supported as they are by the research and practice discussed here, these points could be of immense value to educators.

The chapters that follow offer a brief historical overview of the teaching and inquiry that have occurred in this country and a discussion of the last few decades of serious investigation in the area of written composition at the elementary level. It is hoped that this examination of past and present trends will not only point out where we now stand and offer supportive evidence for educators but also suggest new directions for further study.

REFERENCES

Golub, L.S. "Syntactic and Semantic Elements of Students' Oral and Written Discourse: Implications for Teaching Composition" (Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1967). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1967, 28, 2664A. (University Microfilms No. 67-17427) [ED 033 117]

Lundsteen, S.W. *Children Learn to Communicate*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1976. (a)

Lundsteen, S.W. *Ideas Into Practice: Teaching-Learning Strategies Illustrated by Lessons and Units*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1976. (b)

Robinson, H.A., & Burrows, A.T. (Eds.). *Teacher Effectiveness in Elementary Language Arts: A Progress Report*. Urbana, Ill.: National Conference on Research in English and ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills, 1974. [ED 089 317]

2 Research Then and Now

The history of composition research in America is brief. Even allowing the broad criteria for research that may have been acceptable at an earlier time, studies purporting to be systematic investigations go back only a short time. Compared with studies in reading, those in composition teaching began much later. Research reports in composition prior to the 1920s are hard to find, limited in number, and scant in coverage.

Historical Beginnings

Perhaps the first bona fide, systematic investigation of composition teaching in this country was done by Colvin and Meyer (1906). It is interesting that the focus of their inquiry at that comparatively early date was upon some aspects of creative processes, still a concern in the current decade of the seventies.

Cycles of research pursuit, which have progressed in varying directions, have become a little more clearly discernible as the twentieth century has moved into its final quarter. At times, attention to correct form seemed to engage most energies. Then came questions about the length of sentences, the total number of words in a composition, and the number of different words used. Vocabulary studies in other areas of the language arts were being conducted at the same time and may have sparked this interest, but there is scant evidence in this area of who influenced whom. At various times, certain studies dominated professional interest by virtue of their uniqueness and the amounts of publicity given to certain investigators or their products.

A little later, developmental studies of sentence complexity examined the relationship of grammatical structure to age and social and mental development. Linking sentence-writing maturity to oral maturity appears in retrospect to have occurred at roughly

the same period, beginning in the 1930s. Both kinds of relationship are still being examined but, of course, with refinements built upon foundations erected in the 1920s. These refinements were both in research design and in provision for the many variables of oral and written language, as well as content and social motive. New insights from psycholinguistics on the generating of original sentences versus sentence imitation have also strengthened interest in children's syntax.

A discernible trend, though one lacking as yet in precise delineation, is the movement away from larger and larger test populations to smaller representative samples. This is no surprise; similar evolution occurred in researching other fields of learning. A still further narrowing of focus, probably influenced by Piaget's resurgence in the 1960s and by other psychological inquiry, has resulted in the use of the case study as a productive research method. This individual approach has the life-stimulating quality of bringing together the many facets of cognitive-affective operations and their relation to past experience and present environment.

These swings of emphasis from the laboratory to the classroom, from isolated phenomena to simultaneous, integrated phenomena, have not been regular or clearcut. If, indeed, these are verifiable trends, such changes can serve as a beginning in the history of an important educational activity. The quest for ever better ways of facilitating literacy, even in an age of electronic literacy, is not to be taken lightly.

Some Historical Documents

Nationally known educational documents give us clues as to what was happening in composition teaching during the last years of the nineteenth century and the first three quarters of the twentieth century. At least these published curricular outlines show us the needs as seen by outstanding leaders as early as the famous Committee of Ten (1894).

Committee of Ten Report. Although the Committee of Ten Report obviously aimed at a revision of then current high school programs, it also formulated requirements for elementary school children's education in English. Only a few of the prescriptions in composition serve to give the flavor of the whole for pre-high school learners. Under the heading, "The Study of English in Schools below the High School Grade," were the following points, among others:

> If the pupil is to secure control of the language as an instrument for the expression of his thoughts, it is necessary (1) that, during this

period of life when imitation is the chief motive principle in education, he should be kept so far as possible away from the influence of bad models and under the influence of good models, and (2) that every thought which he expresses, whether orally or on paper, should be regarded as a proper subject for criticism as to language. Thus every lesson in geography or physics or mathematics may and should become a part of the pupil's training in English . . .

A. "Language" and composition. During the *first two years* at school, children may acquire some fluency of expression by reproducing orally in their own words stories told them by their teachers and by inventing stories about objects and pictures.

Not later than the first term of the *third school-year*, children should begin to compose in writing. To assist them in overcoming mechanical difficulties (as far as punctuation, the use of capitals, etc.), they should be required to copy and to write from dictation and from memory short and easy passages of prose and verse.

From the beginning of the *third* to the end of the *sixth* school-year, "language-work" should be of three kinds:

1. Oral and written exercises in the correct employment of the so-called "irregular" verbs, of pronominal forms, and of words and phrases frequently misused.
2. Oral and written exercises in the most elementary form of composition, that is, in the construction of sentences of various kinds. The matter out of which the sentences are to be constructed may, if necessary, be supplied by the teacher; but the pupil should, from his earliest years, be encouraged to furnish his own material, expressing his own thoughts in a natural way. The greatest care should be taken to make these exercises practical rather than technical and to avoid the errors of old-fashioned routine method of instruction in grammar.
3. The writing of narratives and descriptions. These exercises should begin with the *third school-year* and should be continued throughout the course. The subjects assigned should gradually increase in difficulty: in the *seventh and eighth school-years*, if not earlier; they may often be suggested by the pupil's observation or personal experience. (p. 87)

Hosic Report. A second document that shaped secondary school teaching, but that had implications for elementary school teaching, was the famed Hosic Report (1917). The emphases of this curriculum guide upon students' experiences and upon actual communication seem clear from the following brief excerpt:

The point of view of the committee on composition in the seventh, eighth, and ninth grades may be stated as follows:

1. Training in composition is of equal importance with the study of literature and should have an equal allowance of time. Composition work should find place in every year of the school course.
2. Subjects for composition should be drawn chiefly from the pupil's life and experience. To base theme work mainly upon the literature studied leads pupils to think of composition as a purely academic exercise, bearing little relation to life.
3. Oral work should be conducted in intimate relation with written work, and ordinarily the best results will follow when both are taught by the same teacher.
4. Theory and practice should go hand in hand. The principles of grammar and rhetoric should be taught at the time and to the extent that they are aids to expression.
5. If examinations are given, they should be so framed as to be a test of power rather than of mere memory. (p. 36)

The report of Hosic and his committee took a rather firm stand against the doctrine of formal discipline, which was fundamental in the Committee of Ten Report, particularly in the secondary school. It should be noted that both of these historical publications formulated guidance for high school teachers with an obviously selective function for college preparation. Though neither document had administrative power, the influence of both was enormous—and possibly still is.

The focus of this present bulletin on research in composition in the elementary schools—aiming to help teachers meet the needs of children and of society, and taking cognizance of developmental periods of growth in composition—seems proper today. In 1917 the focus would have been revolutionary. It would have been heresy to use research-discovered knowledge for curricula in elementary schools and to give emphasis to individual differences as a foundation upon which later education should build.

Hatfield Report. A third nationally famous document clearly sounded the need for a great variety of experiences to fortify creativity (Hatfield, 1935). Hatfield's work included a wealth of detailed suggestions for classroom teachers with ample, but not excessive, treatment of goals and theory. Values stemming from actual communication, relationships between oral and written expression, individual differences, functions of imaginative and factual writing, and other "modern" concerns were treated sympathetically and helpfully in this first report of the Curriculum Commission of the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE).

The foregoing documents, influential as they were, did not usher in an unopposed sequence of progress or even of change. Antagonism sprang up quickly and attracted many followers. Some of this opposition was a healthy dynamism within the profession. Some was opposition for the sake of publicity. There were and are many sources of conflict. An upsurge in research in the 1920s and 1930s revealed new data about child and adult vocabulary, spelling facility, job needs, and individual differences. Gulfs between college preparation and individual differences became wider, with compulsory education and nearly universal high school attendance. And there were those with vested interests or those who stayed with earlier concepts because of respect for "worthy tradition."

Outside of the profession, parent opposition for many reasons often became divisive. Books by genuinely concerned lay people, as well as by opportunists, appeared in spurts of publication—as they do today. Writing and reading are often at the center of community frustration. Instructional emphases have responded variously to these controversies. And, quite clearly, research reflects these professional-social events. Ideally, research students seek to test hypotheses rather than to "prove" merit for one approach over another. This attitude has sometimes been difficult for investigators to live up to, however, and some studies have shown bias rather than dispassionate scholarship.

Stimuli to Research in Children's Composition

As in other academic disciplines, research in composition has responded to a number of stimuli. Moreover, as investigation in medicine, physics, chemistry, finance, behavioral sciences, and other areas has increased, an atmosphere of respect for research has grown to positive enthusiasm. It is doubtful that professional organizations could have allotted some of their meager budgets to research in the 1920s but for this change in attitude. In the 1960s such budgeting was no mere possibility but an actuality. For example, the NCTE Research Foundation was instituted in 1963 and by January 1976 had helped to support eight research projects dealing with composition (see Appendix A).

In 1970, NCTE instituted another practice as a stimulant to research in English teaching—the annual award to Promising Young Researchers. These awards are presented each year at NCTE's Annual Convention. Of the twenty-nine awards made thus far, five have been given to students for worthy investigations in composition (see Appendix B).

Yet another encouragement to research in composition and to other facets of English learning and teaching has been the gradual increase in listings of relative studies both in professional periodicals and in separately published summaries. Looking back from the vantage point of the 1970s, it is amazing that such helpful presentations began only a mere twenty-odd years ago. Oscar Haugh's listing (1952) was one of the very first. Others followed, but nearly all coupled composition with other aspects of English teaching (see Appendix C). Such diversity does not decrease their value; it merely shows how belatedly research in composition has amassed enough citations to justify separate publication.

The first such separate publication, *Children's Writing: Research in Composition and Related Skills*, was a product of the National Conference on Research in English (NCRE) (Burrows, 1960). This bulletin was the work of six leaders in language arts teaching, each of whom presented the outstanding research in a specific area of the language arts and offered interpretations and implications of those studies.

A report written by Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer (1963) deserves particular note among research listings in composition. A committee of ten persons, including the authors and representing various levels of education, met to plan a way to sum up the research knowledge then in existence and to point to high quality research in such a manner as to improve the quality of future efforts. The resulting report is a milestone in the continuity of research and a base-line compendium for serious students (see Appendix C).

The strategy developed by the committee involved a large number of teachers in universities and other teacher education schools and officials in state departments and administrative agencies, each of whom was asked to send to the committee reports of recent and ongoing investigations with which they were familiar. These reports were selectively screened, and many were eventually included in a bibliography of 504 citations. Five of the composition studies were selected as meeting all or nearly all of the criteria of excellence which had been delineated by members of the committee. These five studies were presented in considerable detail to illustrate the possibilities and difficulties of composition research.

In light of the efforts of Braddock and the members of his committee, it seems timely to point out that the quality of research in composition has improved, and it appears that this might be appropriately demonstrated by examining one of the outstanding investigations of recent years (others are discussed in later chapters).

A Modern Exemplary Study

Donald Graves was the recipient of an NCTE Promising Researchers Award in 1973 for his dissertation on children's writing. He examined and reported in revealing detail many of the salient aspects of the writing process among seven-year-old children in a predominantly lower-middle class community made up largely of blue collar workers.

Graves described class programs, specific teaching activities in other areas as well as in composition, a variety of stimuli, peer relationships, class requirements, and the "atmosphere" of each of four second-grade classes. Two classes were categorized as formal (more large-group work) and two as informal (more small-group and individual work). Community patterns and expectations were noted partly through parent interviews.

Two children were selected in each class for detailed case studies. Of these, one was reported for the final dissertation in comprehensive detail. All students kept writing folders; all were interviewed as to what they thought a "good writer" was. The aim of whole class involvement as the social context in which the case-study students were involved was to learn some characteristics of the many seven year olds and to avoid self-consciousness for a few selected students.

Graves kept elaborate but manageable records of activities carried on as individuals wrote—re-reading of last word or of the total amount written, getting help from the teacher, from peers, from other resources, struggles over spelling, and many more simultaneous and follow-up behaviors. Assigned writings and unassigned writings were analyzed as to frequency of occurrence, length, and content.

Many of Graves's conclusions were formulated as hypotheses. Among the fourteen or more hypotheses that emerged from voluminous data, several seem highly significant.

> In informal environments children have more opportunity for choices to write, write more, and write longer products than when given definite assignments.
>
> Informal environments apparently favor boys; formal environments apparently favor girls.
>
> In either formal or informal environments, children write longer when writing about their own choice of topics or events.
>
> The student's developmental level in writing is more influential than environment or methods in affecting writing behavior.

Graves's study, instead of comparing Class Procedure A with Class Procedure B, combines the values of analyzing social process as it influences individuals in certain specifics. This unique case-study method—individuals in a social fabric of class, school, small-group, parents, and community—sets an example for learning about the myriad actions and interactions that characterize the total complex of composing as done by elementary school children of similar socioeconomic status and ethnic background.

NCRE

The National Conference on Research in English was organized in 1937. That event itself was testimony to the growing need for knowledge. The nature of language, of psycholinguistic development, of communication needs, of children's literature, of reading in elementary and secondary schools—all this and much more have been and are the concern of this small organization. Its executive committee has deemed it timely to report a second time—through this bulletin—upon the background, the current needs, and the directions of possible greatest value in research in composition. That a second summation and stock-taking should be needed only fifteen years after a first report and some seventy years after the probable beginnings of such investigation in this country indicates something of the growing momentum of many kinds of systematic inquiry.

The studies discussed in this chapter have reflected some of our most productive approaches to research on children's composition. A look backward puts progress in perspective. The next chapter puts a further focus on contributions from developmental knowledge.

REFERENCES

Braddock, R., Lloyd-Jones, R., & Schoer, L. *Research in Written Composition*. Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1963. (Assisted by the NCTE Committee on the State of Knowledge about Composition.) [ED 003 374]

Burrows, A.T. (Chair). *Children's Writing: Research in Composition and Related Skills*. Urbana, Ill.: National Conference on Research in English and National Council of Teachers of English, 1960. [ED 090 546]

Colvin, S.S., & Meyer, I.F. "Imaginative Elements in Written Work of Children." *Pedagogical Seminary*, March 1906, *13*, 84-93.

Graves, D.H. "Children's Writing: Research Directions and Hypotheses Based upon an Examination of the Writing Processes of Seven-Year-Old Children" (Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1973). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1974, 34, 6255A. (University Microfilms No. 74-08375) [ED 095 586]. (Also see his article, "An Examination of the Writing Processes of Seven-Year-Old Children." *Research in the Teaching of English*, 1975, 9, 227-241.)

Hatfield, W. (Chair). *An Experience Curriculum in English*. A Report of the NCTE Curriculum Commission. New York: D. Appleton-Century for the National Council of Teachers of English, 1935.

Haugh, O.M. "Representative Research in the Communication Skills." *Education*, 1952, *72*, 470-480.

Hosic, J.F. (Chair and Compiler). *Reorganization of English in Secondary Schools* (Bulletin No. 2). Washington, D. C.: Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education, 1917.

Report of the Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies (With the Reports of the Conferences Arranged by the Committee). Sponsored by the National Education Association (NEA). New York: American Book Company, 1894.

3 Review of Development in Children's Language and Composition

Some Dimensions of Definition

What is it a child does when asked to write? Children's writing sometimes is distinguished as either composing or handwriting. This distinction frequently points up the active, personal, and especially cognitive and affective aspects of composing. At the same time, the contrast sometimes pictures handwriting as a relatively mechanical, or almost exclusively motor, skill devoid of much relation to anything spontaneous or thoughtful. It is often assumed that handwriting is a skill to be practiced until a certain uniformity is reached both in perception and in production. And it is then further assumed that one maintains the skill, unchanged and ungrowing, until illegible writing is seen as fashionable (witness the signature of many famous individuals, those who imitate them, and, as some would note, the prescription writing of physicians).

It seems as if there always has been a somewhat clumsy dichotomy between writing (as in composing) and handwriting (as in producing legible scribbles) wherein handwriting emphasizes form and writing or composing reflects the substance. Realistically, the extreme of neither condition normally is found. That is, the best content cannot be judged to be "best," if it is, in the main, illegible to the reader. And, conversely, by conventional standards, there is no content to be found in a randomly arranged string of otherwise beautifully formed letters. In recent years, there has been considerable evidence of "leniency" toward the so-called mechanics of writing, whether these mechanics be "neatness of script," "good grammar" (in an outmoded school-grammar sense), or "correct spelling."

Currently, two developments happily, and even excitingly, are bringing about a major reaffirmation of the truly integral and mutually reciprocal relationship between children's writing and the entire

range of language skills. One development, reflected primarily in field practice by enlightened encouragement for children to write expressively and freely, has at least implicitly acknowledged the basic source of the written product: children's language, the medium through which they largely relate to and about the world. The other development, reflected primarily in several research efforts, increasingly suggests a direct link between children's initial writing experience, their knowledge of phonology, their acquisition of spelling skills, and their learning to read. In one of the most fascinating areas of lively research interest, there have been some recent cross-cultural indications that even children's development of the perception of handwriting is intimately linked to the saliency of written language and orthographic features (spelling) within the children's environments.

All of the issues mentioned above should be considered in the broadest context of what children have to offer and what teachers, and others, can give—that is, on the one hand, what it is that children put into the writing process as a result of what they bring with them from the totality of their environment, and, on the other hand, what and how teachers can contribute in order to have all children writing.

Definitions Abroad and at Home

Representative and widely influential authors on children's writing, both in the United States (Burrows et al., 1964) and in other English-speaking parts of the world (Lane & Kemp, 1967), long have advocated that we look to what *children can do* before we talk about what *teachers should do*. And, though all may use slightly different terminology, their views reflect a certain commonality with respect to children's potential. For example, Mayfield (1967) speaks well for some schools of thought in Great Britain when he maintains,

> Essentially, Creative Writing, Imaginative Writing, or—a name I prefer borrowed from Margaret Langdon (1965)—Intensive Writing, is concerned with encouraging children to use fully what they have within themselves: ideas, impressions, feelings, fears, hopes, their imagination and such language as they can command. It is an attempt to get at the nine-tenths of the iceberg of a child's mind that he does not often use in the kind of formal work suggested by the name "composition." (p. 10)

In much the same fashion, Carlson speaks for many in the United States when she discusses writing as a "total act of expression,"

while noting that "unfortunately writing is not an easy activity. It involves the total being in a process of learning a more and more complex skill" (1970, pp. vii-viii). Carlson nicely sets the stage for something between what she calls "a monkey jumping through a hoop" approach (a crude stimulus-response, mechanistic approach) and the creating child characterized by the situation where "no outside teacher or adult dare tamper with the writing process or product." Rather, she suggests "a hierarchical chain which itself contains many [undefined] processes . . . and all can be barricaded if things go wrong." For example, she cites a case where a child "may stop on a plateau until he acquires a competency in syntax and such English mechanics as spelling and penmanship" (Carlson, 1970, p. viii). Although I am not at all sure that I agree with Carlson with regard to her last "barricade-at-the-plateau" suggestion, I do find her insistence on shying away from extremes ("the monkey" or the "untouchable creating child") a healthy position which bears repeating.

Before leaving definitional considerations, it is worth noting that, despite pleas for more rigorous approaches (Wright, 1971) and the general appeal for continued research into the writing process as it relates to human functioning (Weigl, 1972), there probably will always remain considerable differences among those whose interpretations are characterized by different emphases but who nonetheless share equal concerns for improving writing. This point is best illustrated by two citations, out of context but hopefully thought provoking. The first is from Maybury (1967), who suggests that "there should be plenty of discussion so that the children can give their ideas an airing" (pp. 14-15). The second is from Pierson (1972), who, in commenting on research in teaching writing, takes his lead from Shakespeare ("The forms of things unknown, the poet's pen/Turns them to shapes and gives to airy nothing/A local habitation and a name"—*A Midsummer Night's Dream*, V) and insists, "It is difficult to count airy nothings" (p. 75).

Controversies and Current Practices

A prime, all-encompassing controversy is the business of *correction*—making certain, for example, that at some stages the form of letters, the composition of words, and the "well-formedness" of written language approach an adult norm. (All of these requirements and the time of their mastery constitute another series of major subsets of controversy!) In short, the issues are whether, when, and how children should display "neat" letters and hand-

writing, "correct" spelling, grammatically "correct" sentences, the use of the "right (colorful?) word," to say nothing of paragraph organization and several other related issues.

Simply put, most teachers take some stand on all these matters; the likelihood of being casual about them is remote. These issues can be debated, but all too often a major point—that of priorities in time for certain skills acquisition—is overlooked.

A stunning example (or at least it seems so to me) of one who has put these matters into concise and compelling perspective is the former Chief Inspector of Primary Schools in England, who in his book *Good Enough for the Children?* had the following to say regarding notions of correction:

> No human skill or art can be mastered unless it is constantly practised. A short composition once a fortnight, interspersed with formal exercises, is no good at all. There must be bulk. If that is accepted, the argument goes on, the children must have a period in their lives when you let them rip. They learn to speak in this way—by continual chatter of which only a tiny proportion is in any sense corrected—and they must learn to write similarly, by writing far more than any teacher could ever possibly correct or even look over. This also seems perfectly sensible as far as it goes. I should like to see all juniors keeping diaries, writing stories, editing magazines, writing letters and generally performing those writing activities which have always been quite familiar features in educated families. The theory that if mistakes go uncorrected when they are first made they will be perpetuated won't bear much examination or we should all cut pretty sorry figures. (as cited by Maybury, 1967, p. 19).

Some seemingly unrelated experiments suggest that far more could be done to stimulate writing through the use of aural stimuli. As one large-scale endeavor, which was directed at older pupils, the Australian Council for Educational Research (1968) sponsored a nationwide experimental radio broadcast (carried by the Australian Broadcasting Company) to which students responded in writing after hearing a variety of aural stimuli. The results were compared with those from students whose written responses followed exposure to other verbal and pictorial stimuli. Perhaps not surprisingly, one of the conclusions confirmed that the "presence of 'sound' in the life of young Australians can provide a meaningful stimulus [for writing] for them." Perhaps there has been an overly exclusive reliance by some on the notion of "quiet while writing!"

Research on Developmental Relationships among Reading, Writing and Spelling

For some time now, a number of individuals (e.g., Fleming, 1971; Goodman & Fleming, 1969; Smith, 1971) have emphasized the importance of examining explicitly the psycholinguistic nature of the reading process. In the broadest terms, it has been maintained that insights into the ways children learn to read, or react to written language, may be had by looking closely at the ways they acquire their oral language, an area about which we now know a considerable amount (Brown, 1973). More specifically, there have been increasingly frequent and insistent claims for learning about the reading and learning-to-read processes by looking at the degree of similarity between the underlying processes of speaking (producing as well as understanding utterances) and comprehending written language. The strongest views here would suggest direct analogues between the two processes; weaker positions would argue for some degree of parallelism between the two processes. In any event, thanks to those who have extended the work of Smith (1971), for example, we continue to accumulate evidence for the claim of interrelatedness among several language-based areas. Niles (1974), for example, has furthered our understanding of how elementary school children—even quite young ones—make use of featural and letter dependency information in recognizing words. Thus, children reflect strategies which begin to resemble, at least in part, the ways many adult readers make use of some of these same cues.

Writing before reading. Continuing with an interest in the relationships among child language, reading, and writing, Cazden (1972) has suggested that an area worthy of more investigation than it has yet received is that of reading instruction that proceeds from writing to reading. There of course have been approaches which have recommended this direction; Montessori (1965), perhaps one of the best known, long ago suggested that the child go from writing—usually individual letters—to reading. Also see modern research by R. Stauffer & Hammond (1969) and M. Stauffer (1973) on the language-experience approach to reading. For example, M. Stauffer found that on a sample of creative writing a random sample of the language-experience approach group achieved significantly higher scores (p is less than .01) than a random sample of the basal reading group on measures of diversity of vocabulary, story content, mechanics of writing, and spelling. Of related interest are the MacKay and Thompson (1968) reading materials used in

England and the American adaptation, *Breakthrough to Literacy* (Bomar publishers). These language-experience-approach materials seem to reflect in modern dress some of what Montessori had in mind. With regard to this topic, C. Chomsky's (1970) work has gone a long way toward reviving serious interest in the relationships between children's reading, writing, and phonology.

Spelling and writing. C. Chomsky (1970), incorporating the theories developed by N. Chomsky (1970) and others, has suggested that far too much emphasis has been placed on the phoneme-grapheme relationship as a building block in learning to read and not enough on being concerned with furthering children's shift to a more realistic and necessary (though abstract) level—that of moving from a phonetic interpretation of the spelling system to a lexical one. That is, children should be given more opportunities to appreciate, if at first only in a partially conscious manner, the *similarities* (rather than the surface-structure *differences*) between English phonology and English orthography. "Connections should be brought out among words that he [the child] already knows but may not yet have classified together, and new words should be introduced for the purpose of establishing new connections" (C. Chomsky, 1970, p. 302). It should be noted that an overriding concern here is with *meaning*, meaning in the child's terms. A most readable introduction to C. Chomsky's important work can be found in her article "Write Now, Read Later" (1971), in which she outlines, in nonspecialized language, her views and suggestions on the relationships under discussion.

As has been indicated, spelling is an important dimension in writing and certainly in writing and reading. It is probably fair to say that, if spelling is taken into account in children's learning to read—as in instances where children will write and therefore need to produce some approximation to the adult norm—the usual tack is to give the "correct" spelling to a child who asks for it, with minor "lenient" variations, including the teacher's "acceptance" of something close from the child.

Much related to C. Chomsky's work discussed above is Read's (1971, 1973) work on preschool children's knowledge of English phonology (sound system). Although it will be relatively difficult for some to establish a few necessary points of reference, his work has important implications for our understanding of how children relate meaning and sound and, then, how they represent this meaning, or, in other words, how they spell when they write. Read's findings are broadly sketched below:

> The evidence of phonological knowledge comes from pre-school children who invented their own spelling system for English, influenced relatively little by the standard system. In each case, the child first learned the conventional names of the letters of the alphabet; then with blocks or some other movable-alphabet toy, began to spell words; and finally produced written messages of all kinds, including stories, letters, and poems. The writing began as early as age three and one half, usually before the child was able to read, and certain parts of the spelling system persisted well into the first grade, where they gradually gave way to standard spellings under the influence of formal instruction in reading and writing.
>
> Such spontaneous spelling is relatively rare. Apparently, it depends on the coincidence of the child's interests and abilities with various other factors, such as the attitudes of the parents, particularly their tolerance for what appears to be bad spelling. In fact, the invented spellings sometimes look so little like English that parents and teachers may be unable to read them and may disregard or even suppress them. Hence, it is difficult to assess the actual (or potential) frequency of such early invented spelling. This report is based on twenty selected clear cases, together with some marginal ones.
>
> What is significant, even from so few cases, is that each child arrived at roughly the same system, using certain spellings that seem implausible to his parents and teachers, but which can be explained in terms of hypotheses about the children's implicit organization of English sounds. (1971, pp. 3–4).

The writings of Gillooly (1973) on the influence of writing system characteristics on learning to read, as well as, for example, Klima's (1972) suggestions concerning the relationships between alphabets and their potential reflections of language may represent relatively difficult reading, but they are strongly recommended as sources of much insight into the related areas of children's language and emerging abilities in writing, spelling, and reading.

Thus, there is increasingly strong research evidence to link areas of children's language with their pre-reading and reading abilities and with their spelling abilities. Mention needs to be made here also of C. Chomsky's (1970) work revealing children's progressive understanding of certain syntactic elements (i.e., the passive voice) beyond the early years and into the middle grades. Somewhat related to her findings that children "don't know it all [regarding syntax] by age four" is Downing's (1970) research on kindergarteners', first graders' and second graders' knowledge of language concepts used by teachers in the language of instruction, such as "beginning sound," "word," or "sentence." (He found enormous concept confusion over these elements of reading and written composition.)

Relations between speaking and composition. Given the above language relations to composition, what about a remaining language arts area—speaking? Burgess (1973) expresses the "strong" view on the relationship between children's speaking and writing:

> Let me close by attempting to face squarely the issue of how children learn to write. Before the child learns to write he learns to talk—and we know a certain amount about the way that ability is acquired. We know, for example, that he acquires his syntax by a process of refinement; . . . We know too that talk about the way in which the child acquires language which sees the central process in terms of imitation, or alternatively in coming to associate words with certain things, misdirects us as to the kind of thing language is. Rather we have to give a central place to the fact that the child has to interpret the language that he hears about him, that he has to feel his way, essentially experimentally, towards its rules, and that he learns it in the context of his own world, his own purposes and his own meanings.
>
> *There is little reason to suppose that the process of learning to write is radically different.* He has, of course, to master the writing *system*—a relatively specific matter. Thereafter his development as a writer depends on his general acquiring of resources and his ability to mobilize them in specific writing tasks. (pp. 19-20)

There is some evidence that even the most rudimentary stages of writing, illustrated by children's scribbling, may reflect more of children's emerging tacit knowledge of language—their overall linguistic "awareness"—than we might have expected. Some of the suggestions of Gibson and Levin (1975) about the importance of children's scribbling are important here, as are the findings of a study by Lavine (1972), which differed substantially from an intercultural investigation by Keislar, Hsieh, and Bhasin (1972).

Lavine conducted a cross-cultural study in which she explored the development of prereading children's perceptions of writing. She presented selected characteristics of writing to children ranging in age from three to six and a half years and representing three widely differing environments (Ithaca, New York; Merida, Yucatan; and Pustunich, a small Mexican peasant village). Her aim was to assess the degree to which these children would use the selected writing characteristics in their perceptual differentiation of writing from other graphic displays. She reached the following conclusions: (1) At an early age prereading children perceive writing as a linear varied string of non-iconic units. Some as early as age three differentiate geometric forms and Chinese characters from conventional units (Roman letters). Only younger *Ss* in the least literate

environment expressed no concept of writing. (2) Learning occurs before children can read and without tutoring. (3) Differentiation increases with age and is most accurate in cultures in which writing is salient in the environment. (4) Developmental trends indicate increasing reliance on the units (letters) and decreasing reliance on linearity, multiplicity and variety. (5) Results suggest that graphic differentiation of letters through self-instruction may play an important role in the beginning stages of reading.

Following Lavine, it would seem as if we have overlooked some important language-related areas at one of the most basic levels of children's interaction with their environment—their beginning experiences with writing. Moreover, it would seem that the distinction between writing, composing, and handwriting, though often maintained for good reasons, may not represent that strong, consistent, or persistent a psychologically real dichotomy, particularly with respect to preschool children and primary-age children who are deepening their tacit knowledge and extending their use of language, including spelling and learning to read.

A View from Collectors of Children's Compositions.

Although little "hard" research exists in the plentiful examples in carefully reported records and in school publications (Burrows et al., 1964; Clegg, 1964; Golub, 1971; Lundsteen, 1976), these sources suggest hypotheses concerning characteristics of children's composition according to increases in age. For example, there appear to be progressions in plot construction, characterization, choice of revealing detail, sequencing, support of main ideas, ability to make choices in forming and arranging sentences, coordination, subordination, and use of transitions (Burrows, 1960; Hunt, 1965). The compositional thought of children moves from memory of direct, sensory experience to pictured images of concrete objects held in inner speech thought (Vygotsky, 1962). The child's written thought moves from a few words to whole incidents and finally to the complex ordering of experience through various forms of literature, such as the folktale, fable, myth, and fantasy (Nebraska Curriculum Development Center, 1966).

Summary

In summary, developmental research shows definitional problems and reflects controversy. Some past work has described trivia or been merely hortatory. It appears best to try to find out what a child does when asked to write and relate behavior to theoretical, linguistic, developmental frameworks recognizing both cognition

and affect and possible relations to early motor skill (scribbling) and perceptions of graphics. Divisions and distinctions may not represent young children who are deepening their tacit knowledge and use of language, including spelling and beginnings of reading. Recent research in the United States, England, and Australia holds promise when considered in the context of what children bring with them from their environments to put into their writing processes and products. The truism of interrelations among the language arts holds when examining children's composition. We "have a way yet to go" to discover just how much more children can do in relation to what we believe teachers should do to have more children writing productively and with increasing variety and maturity. Whitehead (1970), who has put together an insightful compendium of ideas, suggests that we must persist in our attempts to know just what it is we ask our pupils to do when we persuade them to write personally, imaginatively, and creatively. The term *persuade* implies a dimension called *motivation*—the topic of the next chapter.

REFERENCES

Blackie, J. *Good Enough for the Children?* London: Faber, 1966.

Brown, R. *A First Language: The Early Stages.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973. [ED 088 070]

Burgess, C. et al. *Understanding Children Writing.* Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, Ltd., 1973. [ED 078 432]

Burrows, A.T. (Chair). *Children's Writing: Research in Composition and Related Skills.* Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1960. [ED 090 546]

Burrows, A.T., Jackson, D.C., & Saunders, D.O. *They All Want to Write: Written English in the Elementary School* (Rev. ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Carlson, R.K. *Writing Aids through the Grades: One Hundred Eighty-Six Developmental Writing Activities.* New York: Teachers College Press, 1970. [ED 048 277]

Carlson, R.K. *Sparkling Words: Two Hundred Practical and Creative Writing Ideas* (Rev. ed.) Berkeley, Calif.: Wagner Printing Company, 1973. (Distributed by NCTE) [ED 018 417]

Cayer, R.L., Green, J., & Baker, E.E., Jr. *Listening and Speaking in the English Classroom: A Collection of Readings.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1971. [ED 057 049]

Cazden, C.B. *Child Language and Education.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972. [ED 068 989]

Chomsky, C. "Reading, Writing and Phonology." *Harvard Educational Review,* Spring 1970, *40,* 287-309.

Chomsky, C. "Write Now, Read Later." *Childhood Education,* 1971, *47,* 296-299.

Chomsky, N. "Phonology and Reading." In H. Levin and J. Williams (Eds.), *Basic Studies on Reading.* New York: Basic Books, 1970.

Clegg, A.B. *The Excitement of Writing.* London: Chatto & Windus, 1964. [ED 023 664]

Downing, J. "The Development of Linguistic Concepts in Children's Thinking." *Research in the Teaching of English,* 1970, *4,* 5-19.

Fleming, J.T. "On Learning from What Is Said and What Is Read." *20th Yearbook of the National Reading Conference.* Clemson, S.C.: National Reading Conference. 1971.

Gibson, E., & Levin, H. *The Psychology of Reading.* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1975.

Gillooly, W.B. "The Influence of Writing-System Characteristics on Learning to Read." *Reading Research Quarterly,* Winter 1973, *8,* 167-199.

Golub, L.S. "Stimulating and Receiving Children's Writing: Implications for an Elementary Writing Curriculum." *Elementary English*, 1971, *48*, 33-49.

Goodman, K., & Fleming, J.T. (Eds.) *Psycholinguistics and the Teaching of Reading*. Newark, Del.: International Reading Association, 1969. [ED 074 446]

Hunt, K.W. *Grammatical Structures Written at Three Grade Levels*. Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1965.

Keislar, E.R., Hsieh, H., & Bhasin, C. "An Intercultural Study: Discrimination and Informal Experience." *Reading Teacher*, November 1972, *26*, 171-179.

Klima, E.S. "How Alphabets Might Reflect Language." In J.F. Kavanagh and I.G. Mattingly (Eds.), *Language by Ear and by Eye*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1972.

Lane, S.M., and Kemp, M. *An Approach to Creative Writing in the Primary School*. London: Blackie and Son, 1967.

Langdon, M. *Let the Children Write*. London: Longmans, 1965. [ED 025 512]

Lavine, L.O. "The Development of Perception of Writing in Pre-Reading Children: A Cross-Cultural Study" (Doctoral dissertation, Cornell University, 1972). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1973, *33*, 4491B. (University Microfilms No. 73-06657)

Lundsteen, S.W. *Children Learn to Communicate*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1976. (Chapter 6, "Developing into Composition")

MacKay, D., and Thompson, B. *The Initial Teaching of Reading and Writing: Some Notes toward a Theory of Literacy* (Programme in Linguistics and English Teaching, Paper No. 3). London: University College and Longmans, 1968.

Maling, J. *Using an Aural Stimulus for a Writing Task* (A Report on the writing produced in response to a nation-wide experimental broadcast on 1 August 1968). Hawthorn, Victoria: Australian Council for Educational Research, 1968.

Maybury, B. *Creative Writing for Juniors*. London: B.T. Batsford, Ltd., 1967.

Montessori, M. *The Montessori Method*. Cambridge, Mass.: Robert Bentley, Inc., 1965.

Nebraska Curriculum Development Center. *A Curriculum for English*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1966. [ED 013 806-ED 013 811]

Niles, J.A. "The Use of Featural and Letter Dependency Information in Word Recognition by Elementary School Children" (Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Albany, 1974). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1974, *35*, 467A. (University Microfilms No. 74-15502)

Philadelphia Suburban School Study Council—Group B. *Stimulating Creative Writing in Elementary Schools*. Affiliated with Educational Research and Service Bureau, University of Pennsylvania, 1967.

Pierson, H. *Teaching Writing*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972. [ED 064 709]

Read, C. "Pre-School Children's Knowledge of English Phonology." *Harvard Educational Review*, February 1971, *41*, 1-34.

Read, C. "Children's Judgments of Phonetic Similarities in Relation to English Spelling." *Language Learning*, 1973, *23* (1), 17-38.

Smith, F. *Understanding Reading: A Psycholinguistic Analysis of Reading and Learning to Read*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.

Stauffer, M.A. "Comparative Effects of a Language Arts Approach and Basal Reader Approach to First-Grade Reading Achievement" (Doctoral dissertation, University of Delaware, 1973). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1974, *34*, 6525A. (University Microfilms No. 74-08748)

Stauffer, R.G., & Hammond, W.D. "The Effectiveness of Language Arts and Basic Reader Approaches to First-Grade Reading Instruction—Extended into Third Grade." *Reading Research Quarterly*, 1969, *4*, 468-500.

Vygotsky, L.S. *Thought and Language*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1962.

Weigl, E. ["Acquisition of Written Language: Neuropsychological and Psycholinguistic Considerations."] *Probleme und Ergebnisse der Psychologie*, 1972, *43*, 45-105.

Whitehead, F., et al. *Creative Experiment: Writing and the Teacher*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1970.

Wright, P. "Writing to be Understood: Why Use Sentences?" *Applied Ergonomics*, December 1971, *2*, 207-209.

4 Is Outer Stimulation a Route to Inner Motivation?

What help does research on motivation offer to teachers of composition? This chapter considers theory, ways, means, and research on motivation of composition and the individual conference as a teaching strategy.

Four Motivational "Allies"

As a figure of speech, we may suggest that children have four "allies" inside of themselves that can increase motivation to write. By way of overview, these allies, which represent children's needs and which have been adapted from the work of the psychologist Sheviakov (1971), are (1) self-competency, (2) modeling, (3) personal acceptance, and (4) peer status.

1. *Self-competency. Children want to feel competent and to respect themselves for it.* Research in sections to follow indicates that activities that give children a sense of their own voice facilitate the will to write. Children intrinsically want to become effective persons, to achieve self-realization. Hearing their voices in recorded story-telling, seeing their own words printed for them and made permanent for sharing—these kinds of activities help to give children a sense of "self" and of competence in language communication that transfers to their writing. The teacher's task becomes the individualizing of instruction so that children can take small steps that are personally successful for them. Such individualizing means that the teacher rarely or never gives the "blanket," identical, "everybody-has-to-do-it" type of writing assignment. (See the later section on the individual writing conference.)

2. *Modeling. Children want to find a strong, competent adult with whom they can identify.* This emulation of adult activity results in acculturation. There are several dimensions and meanings for the

word *modeling*. First, adults or teachers in children's lives may be thought of as models who earn their authority because of their expertise, the status awarded to them by the people they serve, and their relevance to the children's ideas about what models are acceptable. *Modeling* also refers to the children's use of writing products as models that they get ideas from, borrow from, and derive inspiration from. By listening and reading, children turn these literary products into "compost" for making their own writing fertile. (See chapter 5 on the interrelationship of literature and composition for research.)

Adult models. First, consider the dimensions of the adult as the model. Many a young child has been motivated to go off to write (sometimes on the walls) after observing an adored parent working hard at this task. It is a common observation that teachers who thoroughly enjoy writing and who share their products serve as stimulating models for children. But their authority as models may come more from a knowledge of the developmental processes of composition (suggested in chapter 3) and from knowing how to avoid shortchanging an instructional model (Lundsteen, 1976) than from their expertise as writers. Adults can "rub off" on youngsters, not just for a moment but for a lifetime.

Necessary conditions for serving as a model. Teachers of minority children who cannot approximate any match for the minority culture may have a particular problem in serving as models. Such teachers may need to build many bridges between cultures but may not know how to build them or understand the need to build them. A question to ask is, "Has the consent of the community been won, a consent that would give the teacher the authority to be 'in place of parents'?" Other questions are, "Has the teacher been able to identify with the community's highest aspirations? Have the children been invited to participate in planning routines and projects for composition? Do they feel that the classroom is partly theirs, that the tasks of composing are at least partly of their own engineering?" Making one's authority legitimate, rather than merely imposed, is one prerequisite for being an effective model. Another is making modeled behavior sufficiently relevant to the time, age, place, culture, and content of the class and the community.

If teachers would be interest-provoking models, they need to know how to help children reach out from their "little world" into the teacher's "bigger world." For example, if a child says, "I make spiders with the strands of my hair and play with them," then it might be an appropriate time for a teacher to share a poem written on spiders (e.g., parts of "The Spider" by Robert P. Tristam Coffin).

Literary models. The preceding example leads to another dimension of the term *model*: finding appropriate literary models for motivating children to value their own cultures, to express their values in writing, and to transform these feelings of pride into increased feelings of self-competency. Not so long ago sources of material for various cultures for all age levels were hard to find. Now, with sources more available, teachers are becoming increasingly successful in locating materials and in digging them out of their own schools and communities (e.g., Carlson's *Emerging Humanity: Multi-Ethnic Literature for Children and Adolescents*, Wm. C. Brown, 1972).

The Northwestern University Curriculum Center in English has conducted action research developing and testing programs designed to use literary models to expose inner-city school children to ideas, develop their knowledge of structure, and bring them into contact with other desirable aspects of written composition. For example, the specific aim of "Lesson #3" (*Basic Lessons, 2: A Teacher's Experience with Composition*, 1965) was to have children in a cooperative group compose a description of a place in such a way that the details suggested a feeling. As a model, the lesson used the description of the interior of the barn in the book *Charlotte's Web* (Dell, 1967, p. 13). After a stilted attempt with some unfamiliar material, the children in the project selected their own classroom as the subject of the group composition and produced the following (rendering their own experience into writing):

> The school room was very large and old. It smelled of chalk dust and children's clothes. It often had a quiet smell—as if nothing bad could happen in school. It smelled of pencil lead, ink, paste, water-color paints, and crayons. Whenever it rained or snowed, the wet coats and boots in the dressing room smelled like a skunk. When the children walked into the room, it smelled like potatoe chips, candy, nuts, and pumpkin seeds. Most of the time it smelled like smoke and dust. The dust come from the windows; the smoke came from the chimneys.

Recent research does not have much to say about the use of literary models to stimulate writing in the elementary school. From the research reviewed in chapter 5, it appears that Pinkham (1968) found lessons using a "model-from-children's-literature" approach enhanced the writing of some fifth-grade urban children (as measured by the STEP [Sequential Tests of Educational Progress] Writing Test), but they did not appear to greatly affect children living in suburban areas. The need for broader, more sophisticated measurement is evident.

3. *Personal acceptance. Children want to be respected, loved, understood, forgiven, and accepted as they are at the moment.* A child can feel a generalized sense of teacher acceptance when the teacher writes the child's story down in dictation and accompanies this process with warm praise for the child's successes and with sharing. The antithesis of this acceptance is "hemorrhaging" all over the child's written work with a red pencil. Typically such marking is generalized by children as personal rejection not only of their self-expressive discourse but of their total being. With an eye on the ally of personal acceptance, the sensitive teacher also sees to it that harsh peer rejection is avoided. This idea takes us to the next ally.

4. *Peer Status. Children want to be liked by at least some of their classmates.* Children desire to relate to other youngsters in their social milieu. Using an awareness of this ally to promote motivation to write has several important dimensions. These depend in part on the social status of the child in the larger culture and in the school classroom. Again, peer status for the minority child in a mixed group may hinge on the teacher's ability to engender respect for minority group literature and for modes of self-expression. The teacher needs to build favorable peer attitudes toward literacy in its most rewarding sense. Otherwise the child who uses the expressive sensory word or who reads and writes with relish may be locked outside socially. Fader's (1968) experimental work is a testimony to peer prestige possible with paperback literature in the pocket and even with poetry writing in the most unlikely locations—in prison and in inner-city schools.

As suggested, the task of utilizing the peer status ally assumes different aspects with different groups of children. For example, the task of socializing the compositions of privileged children who have a history of competing unmercifully with one another for high academic status means one kind of challenge for the teacher. Working with children in a homogeneous minority group is another kind of challenge, requiring that teachers bring to bear all their knowledge and respect for this culture that differs from the national mainstream. Finally, helping children from a minority culture when they have been supposedly "integrated" into a school of the supposedly high-status culture is a challenge that many teachers must face. This challenge may mean helping isolated minority children to learn not to care too deeply if they cannot seem to win peer status immediately or if they cannot immediately seem to put themselves imaginatively in the place of their peers—anticipating their responses, questions, resistances, and pleasures. The teacher can

eventually help these students to become experts in areas that are of value to their peers and that will increase their prestige within the peer group.

Proceeding from this overview on motivation in the form of four allies, the next section examines some relevant research. To discover what causes children to want to write and what sorts of stimuli make significant changes in their writing has been the focus of only a small number of investigations.

Stimulus or Motivation?—A Confusion

Unfortunately confusion between stimulus and motivation has characterized some of the research. Physical setting in the classroom, varied visual-auditory supports, variety of sequence (e.g., whether oral stimuli follow or precede the actual writing), and other matters of actual operation have been included in investigations. This scrambling of ingredients makes it difficult to determine what the essence of children's motivation to write really consists of. In order to get children to write teachers have used various stimuli, such as creating a display of information and warnings for the safety of persons caught in a storm, writing invitations to another class to see an exhibit, or using torn pieces of paper to write about the dropping of scraps in the school neighborhood. Such stimuli may indeed help to generate energy for the task at hand. But the pre-visualization of these immediate, almost tangible results of one's writing are not in themselves the *basic impulse* to use written symbols to record thought and feeling.

Research into the *why* of children's writing is undoubtedly difficult. Subjectivity characterizes the process and beclouds its analysis. Children themselves cannot tell us much about what they feel and think as they write, although efforts to "think out loud" have been sought in some studies (Emig, 1971; Graves, 1973; Melas, 1974; Sawkins, 1971; Stallard, 1972). The children's later interpretations (later than the actual time of writing) can rarely be obtained and are likely to be rearranged to fit what the children perceive as adult expectations. To bring to consciousness the drives underlying so complex an activity as composing is an elusive task for adults; it may well be an impossible one for children. Hence the need to scrutinize most carefully the results of investigations into the products and processes spurred by external stimuli. Calling these stimuli "motivational devices" is misleading. However, a search for elements in writing behavior that identify drives common to a variety of settings for writing could eventuate in a defensible analysis. A next step would be to formulate these tentative findings as

hypotheses to be tested. Pending this state of research, a critical examination of recent research peripheral to intrinsic motivation could lead into fruitful pursuit.

The Burrus study. Like many other studies "comparing a lot of things with a lot of things," one investigation by Burris (1970) examined the acquisition of certain items of mechanics in a program emphasizing real communication as compared with a program largely emphasizing textbook exercises. This study has the advantage of time—it covered a three-year period. It has the further advantage of focusing upon limited aspects of writing, namely, terminal punctuation, capitalization, spelling, and sentence sense.

The subjects for Burrus's investigation were selected from the total population entering first grade in a university town. Children of university parents were excluded because of the likelihood of their leaving before the three years of the study would be ended. To establish two experimental groups, the remaining sixty children were randomly divided between two entering classes with an equal number of boys and girls in each. Teachers exchanged groups at the beginning of the second year; thirty-two pupils remaining at the end of second grade were consolidated into one third-grade class, and an experimental teacher was assigned to them. Selection of the control groups approximated the above methods. Parents of both groups were equally representative of middle-class socioeconomic status by their location in the community, their education, and their occupations. Principals and primary teachers of the two schools involved met in the spring to become acquainted with plans for the study, which included the progression of two teachers with their pupils for three years.

In the experimental classes, the teaching goal was to stress "real communication." Both group and individual dictation were frequent experiences, with much explanatory comment by teachers as to why they capitalized or indented or used certain marks of punctuation. Individual creative composing through dictation was also a common happening. Typing by the teacher of children's dictated reports or stories was followed in second and third grades by children's preferring to write their own. Children asked for spelling as needed, and they gradually developed some skill in using picture dictionaries, in making their own spelling dictionaries, and in finding words in various sources, such as posters or book titles. When the children finished their stories, they read them to a group, a friend, or to the whole class, or they filed them in their folders to share with their teacher at weekly conferences.

The California Test of Mental Maturity and the Iowa Every Pupil

Test of Basic Skills: Basic Language Skills, Grades 3-5, were administered at the beginning and end of three years, respectively. Teacher-made tests were used for diagnostic purposes. Records for experimental subjects included files of compositions and records of conferences. Of the five areas examined, punctuation, capitalization, and spelling means were significantly higher for experimentals than for controls. For usage and sentence sense, experimental means were slightly higher but did not reach significance.

The superiority of the experimentals' learning of certain mechanics appears an outcome of closely associating the teaching and learning of those items with writing that was vital, immediate, and very frequently communicated to peers. However, other elements, desirable though they may be, intrude upon any clear conclusion that this close association of means-to-end is causal. Individual student conferences and collection of students' writings in satisfying personal folders added value to their writing. Teachers were aware that they were trying something new, both in their liberation from a textbook and in their progressing with students for the three years of the experiment. Amounts of praise or similar reinforcement given by teachers to fortify satisfaction in specific accomplishments are not cited for either controls or experimentals. Thus, many new elements other than sheer motivation stemming from genuine, person-to-person communication enter as variables in the research as reportedly performed.

The Kafka study. Kafka's (1971) study of the effectiveness of four "motivational stimuli" is closer to the central matter of motivation as it affects the writing behavior of children. In intermediate grades of a racially integrated school system, Kafka tested the quality of compositions resulting from four test conditions. Each test condition stressed one of four stimuli: auditory, visual, tactile, and no sensory stimulus. It was found that direct sensory stimuli were always less effective than were the "usual" internal stimuli and at the .01 level of confidence. The investigator concluded that children are likely to write better from internal stimuli than from external ones. Girls tended to write better than boys, whites better than non-whites, high-ability children better than average, average better than low, and older children better than younger.

Interesting as these findings are in relation to the general proposition that "good writing" results from an inner need to externalize feeling, pressure, and thought, one must also inquire as to the effect of the "strange" (unknown) examiner, and whether rating compositions by certain literary or content qualities might have yielded different conclusions.

External "motivational devices." In several studies in recent decades an attempt has been made to evaluate the effect of pre-writing discussion and planning upon the quality of written results. Generally these studies, some carried on in early grades and others in high school and even later, have shown some positive gains. Lacking however, is evidence as to whether such pre-writing teaching increased motivation to write—whether or not the students who had such experiences would *spontaneously* write for an audience or even for their own individual satisfaction. In every study found thus far, follow-up exercises *required* writing from the students. Gratifying as such improvement may be, the essential matter of motivation is not illuminated when assignment is the only stimulus that begets writing. In assessing amounts of research in children's writing, Golub (1973) summarizes as follows:

> Not surprisingly, the weight of recent research in children's writing falls into the area of motivational devices. Barnes (1964) found that second-grade students wrote longer stories, used a wider variety of words, and exhibited greater imagination after using small word cards and grooved boards in assembling sentences. Bortz (1970) assessed the written language patterns of intermediate grade children after they had listened to recorded motivational devices followed by written responses. Children exposed to this treatment wrote the greatest quantity and used more sentence complexity. Zenotti (1970), in an attempt to capitalize on the relationship between oral and written composition, analysed children's written language after they had used tape recorders and found that these sixth graders wrote much longer compositions than did the control group. (p. 5)

That the teachers of the sixth graders noted above used specific devices to generate writing is obvious. However, the necessity of such devices is still highly questionable. It should be noted or recalled that students in all four classrooms of the Graves study (1973), both those categorized as "formal" and those categorized as "informal," did more frequent unassigned writing and produced longer pieces than when the writing was assigned. Factors of concern for their writing were evident in the treatment (for example, keeping of their writing in folders, teacher-pupil conferences, and varied ways of sharing writing), but there was no use of "concrete" objects or a setting up of simulated "newspaper office" or "space ship" or other environments designed to develop atmosphere.

The Tovatt and Miller study. A study by Tovatt and Miller (1967) investigated ninth graders' responses to using tape recorders individually (1) to assist in plans for writing by serving as a memory

bank, (2) to record "thinking out loud" as students wrote, and (3) to edit the cadence of sentences and other qualities that students heard in their own play-backs. The study is valuable for still other reasons, among them the care with which the research was planned and carried out. Excellent facilities available in a laboratory adjoining classrooms, equating of groups, demonstration of the uses of a tape recorder by able teachers for both controls and experimentals, and judicious use of appropriate tests characterize this study. Indeed, it seems to offer guidance as a research model because of the isolation of variables to be studied while preserving the vitality of classroom complexities. Similarities and differences between intrinsic motivation and attractive mechanical devices are considerably clarified in the Tovatt and Miller report. Within these criteria of research rigor, the following conclusions seemed justified by the experiment directors.

> The OAV (Oral Aural Visual) stimuli procedures demonstrated in the first year a general superiority over a conventional approach in increasing student abilities in writing, reading, listening, and language usage. However, rating of compositions from the control and experimental classes was inconclusive in establishing the superiority of either approach. . . .
>
> Although the OAV approach did not seem to result in impressive change toward more positive attitude toward English, the generally high achievement of students taught by the OAV procedures indicates the possible presence of a positive motivational element. (pp. 187-188)

Improvement in writing, reading, listening, and language usage skills is not to be scoffed at. Indeed, these skills are of accepted and demonstrable importance. Perhaps further observation, whether as bona fide research or of an informal nature, may throw some light upon the question of whether greater confidence in writing skills adds to intrinsic motivation for written composing. Students of the nature of motivation for learning in general tend to agree that every experience adds to or takes from the accrued motivation attained by a learning organism. Whether mechanical and other devices as stimuli can fortify satisfactions that add to a growing residuum of motivation is at present only a matter of speculation.

Writing as an artificial experience. There is yet another aspect of motivation that needs serious consideration by researchers—perhaps by researchers more than by other scholars. If it is true that every experience fortifies or weakens previous motivation, innate or learned, then a research task delegated to children or adoles-

cents likewise becomes a learning or un-learning experience. When children are asked to write a reaction to a film, a race, a picture, or an exciting experience, to write a letter to a make-believe audience, or to do any other act of purported communication in writing that in no way involves them in genuine person-to-person relationships, one must ask whether the samples of writing thus obtained represent what the children might do if the situation were real. Applying a further criterion, do children or adults spontaneously write an account of a trip or an imaginative story or a factual report of recently gained information unless that account or story or information is actually read by or heard by and reacted to by a concerned, or at least an "open," audience? Slotnik, (1973), in assessing the writing done by children for the National Assessment in writing, noted the generally "uninspired" tone of their composing. Too much writing done merely to be obedient to a requirement has characterized the school program; researchers need not add to this stultifying experience.

There are alternatives to merely directing children to write or even to explaining that the researcher wants to find out how they feel about a film, a public character, some school issue, or the like. Papers can be duplicated for the researcher's uses and the originals returned for class discussion, for entertainment, or to plan some active campaign or program of work. Typed, corrected copies can be made by the researcher and returned to pupils for their use in pamphlets, illuminated bulletins, bulletin board displays, or tape recordings with additions that come to mind after the writers have done their first thinking (composing) on paper. Carefully edited, the originals can occasionally be copied, illustrated, and used in a class portfolio. In such cases, it is advisable to append a sheet for the names and brief reactions of peer readers, stressing new ideas gained and further questions they might have about the topic or problem. Appreciative comment by researcher or teacher is also highly desirable. In brief, to get valid samples of how children write when part of a communicating society, they must be given a chance to communicate in reciprocal relationships. Lacking this vitality, what children write for many research tasks is likely to be a pallid demonstration of what they think they ought to write.

Hard research data on the generalization that children need a preponderance of genuine communication experiences are now hard to come by, if indeed such data exist at all. However, qualified opinion as to the value of such writing situations is available. Robinson and Burrows (1974) present the opinions of eighteen of our national leaders in language arts education on this matter.

These educators wrote criteria for excellence in language arts teaching behaviors in elementary teachers and twice rechecked their individual contributions and the clarity of the whole document as the items were collated and categorized. The ten criteria of excellence in teaching written composition emphasize the necessity for writing experiences that stress individuality and sharing, whether in aesthetic expression or in work-a-day, informational writing. Such statements as those below characterize the collected opinions. The teacher

> Provides for children's sharing their stories and verse as a valid and essential part of the communication program; often reads aloud the writing of those children whose oral reading is ineffective.
>
> Involves children in genuine communication through practical, informational writing and sees that such writing is shared through oral reading and visual display. (pp. 78-79)

The Individual Conference as Motivational

In this chapter mention has been made on several occasions of the individual conference. The individual writing conference has come to be a valuable teaching situation in the opinion of many students of children's composition. Teacher-student relationships inherent in such a session seem to build morale, to strengthen motivation, and to build a favorable self-concept. At least the opportunity for such positive results is present. No doubt the individual conference could have deleterious effects if an authoritarian, negatively critical stance were taken by the teacher. No accounts of such relationships have been found in current surveys of research reports.

What specifics of skill or other kinds of competence are best accomplished through individual teacher-student meetings? When are such sessions most valuable in the always-pressured work of the average classroom? At least one investigation of certain specifics learned in the individual conference stands ready to give some guidance on this particular teaching behavior.

The Mills study. Mills (1970) studied the differing responses of sixth-grade students in correcting errors in capitalization and terminal punctuation, depending upon whether they read their compositions aloud to proofread or did so silently. The twenty-six subjects of the study represented middle-class families in a small university town. Their Otis-Lennon scores ranged from 85 to 125 with a median of 106. The T-unit was used to determine where terminal punctua-

tion was appropriate. Students wrote one imaginative narrative that they read orally and one they read silently; they also wrote pairs of sensory narratives and adventure narratives that they read silently and orally. Mills is not specific as to the proportion of proofreading exercises that were done within the teacher-student conferences as compared with those done independently by the students alone or in pairs. Rough drafts and final drafts were compared for frequency of the following errors: (a) number of T-units not begun with capitals; (b) number of T-units not ended with full stop punctuation; (c) number of pairs of T-units joined illogically with coordinating conjunctions or commas; and (d) number of fragments punctuated as sentences.

Differences between silent and oral proofreading showed some interesting and useful results: (1) a significant difference (.05 level) favoring the oral over silent proofreading comparing ratios of T-units not begun with capitals to total T-units in rough and final drafts; (2) no significant difference between ratios of T-units not ended with full-stop punctuation to total T-units in rough drafts and final drafts of children who read orally compared with those who read silently; (3) no significant difference between ratios of T-units joined illogically by coordinating conjunctions or commas to total units in rough and final drafts of children who proofread orally compared with those who proofread silently; and (4) a difference, approaching significance, between ratios of fragments punctuated as sentences to total T-units in rough and final drafts of children who proofread orally compared with those who proofread silently.

Implications about the kinds of content that might have influenced punctuation efficiency are valuable, and perhaps most useful of all is the deduction expressed by Mills that children can benefit from both kinds of proofreading. In view of the specifics learned and those not learned in this investigation of both oral and silent and oral proofreading, many other questions arise. Do children in a relationship that is geared to a specific element to be learned also build better rapport and attitudes toward correction as well as some other peripheral learnings of an academic nature? What elements should always be present in a teacher-student conference, or are there no constants of this sort? Consensus exists that teacher-student conferences are desirable, but much closer analysis is needed for maximum return on the investment of time and energy.

Summary

Whether the drive to put words on paper in some coherent

manner in order to convey meaning stems from ego satisfaction, from the urge to relate oneself to others, or from still other basic needs has not been subjected to research analysis. This consideration remains in the realm of philosophical debate. In this chapter we have assumed that children's motivation to write activates their behavior to meet needs similar to those of adults: to relate to others in one's social milieu (personal acceptance and peer status) and to become an effective person (self-competency or self-realization). For most children an additional, unique need is also apparent—to emulate the activities of adults (modeling or acculturation). Often these basic motives merge, whether a child is stimulated to write a story to entertain peers or to write a story or experience for strictly private delectation. However, one need or another in the process of growth may dominate when students decide to put themselves on paper in order to render external some of their inner life—whether for others or for themselves alone. Is outer stimulation a route to inner motivation? Probably not—the basic impulse to express and shape genuine experience and feeling in a more permanent form flows deep.

As suggested in this chapter, one impetus to children's composition is the modeling impulse provoked by exposure and response to children's literature. The next chapter explores these interrelationships of literature and composition.

REFERENCES

Burrus, D.J. "A Three-Year Comparative Study of the Functional Approach to Teaching the Mechanics of Language" (Doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1970). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1971, *31*, 5243A. (University Microfilms No. 71-11110)

Emig, J. *The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders* (Research Report No. 13). Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, Committee on Research, 1971. [ED 058 205]

Fader, D.N., & McNeil, E.B. *Hooked on Books: Program and Proof*. New York: Berkeley Publishing Company, 1968. [ED 038 252]

Golub, L.S. "Written Language Development and Instruction of Elementary School Children." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Conference on Research in English, New Orleans, 1973. [ED 073 474]

Graves, D.H. "Children's Writing: Research Directions and Hypotheses Based upon an Examination of the Writing Processes of Seven-Year-Old Children" (Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1973). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1974, *34*, 6255A. (University Microfilms No. 74-08375) [ED 095 586]

Kafka, T.T. "A Study of the Effectiveness of Four Motivational Stimuli on the Quality of Composition of Intermediate Students in One School District" (Doctoral dissertation, St. John's University, 1971). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1971, *32*, 2549A. (University Microfilms No. 71-30213)

Lundsteen, S.W. *Children Learn to Communicate*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1976. (Chapter 7, "How to Teach Composition")

Melas, D.D. "Differences of Themes in Assigned and Unassigned Creative Writing of Elementary School Children" (Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1974). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1975, *35*, 6577A. (University Microfilms No. 75-09476)

Mills, H.W. *A Comparison of the Effects of Oral Proofreading and Silent Proofreading of Rough Drafts of Compositions in Helping Sixth-Grade Children Develop Greater Sentence Sensitivity*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, 1970.

Petty, W.T., and Finn, P.J. (Eds.). *The Writing Processes of Students: Report of the Annual Conference on Language Arts* (No. 1). Buffalo: State University of New York at Buffalo, 1975.

Pinkham, R.G. "The Effect on the Written Expression of Fifth-Grade Pupils of a Series of Lessons Emphasizing the Characteristics of Good Writing as Exemplified in Selected Works from the Area of Children's Literature" (Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1968). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1969, *29*, 2613A. (University Microfilms No. 69-02168)

Robinson, H.A., & Burrows, A.T. *Teacher Effectiveness in Elementary Language Arts: A Progress Report.* Urbana, Ill.: National Conference on Research in English and ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills, 1974. [ED 089 317]

Sawkins, M.W. "The Oral Responses of Selected Fifth-Grade Children to Questions Concerning Their Written Expression" (Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1971). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1971, *31*, 6287A. (University Microfilms No. 71-16463) [ED 057 046] [Also see her article, "What Children Say about Their Writing." In W.T. Petty & P.J. Finn (Eds.), *The Writing Processes of Students*, op. cit.]

Sheviakov, G.V. *Teaching the Disadvantaged* (Tape cassette album number 5). Los Angeles, Calif.: Listener Corporation, 1971.

Slotnik, H.B. "On the Teaching of Writing: Some Implications from National Assessment." *English Journal*, 1973, *62*, 1249-1253.

Stallard, C.K. "An Analysis of the Writing Behavior of Good Student Writers" (Doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, 1972). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1972, *33*, 3408A. (University Microfilms No. 72-33385)

Tovatt, A.L., & Miller, E.L. "The Sound of Writing." *Research in the Teaching of English*, 1967, *1*, 176-189. [Also see their report, *Oral-Aural-Visual Stimuli Approach to Teaching Written Composition to Ninth-Grade Students* (USOE Project No. 5-03892-12-1). Muncie, Ind.: Ball State University, 1967.]

5 The Interrelationship of Literature and Composition

The relationships between literature and composition have been obvious to many teachers and researchers. Literature is *someone's* creative writing, while creative writing gives children firsthand experience with what happens in literature. Experience with one is thought to enhance experience with the other. Yet the research in this area is inconclusive. Research results do not show conclusively, for example, that experience with literature has a significant effect on composition. The research to date has been limited, however, and the assumption that exposure to literature has a positive effect on writing ability should still receive attention.

Literature as a model for writing. Much more research is needed on the influence of literature on students' creative writing. Children's literature, as the creative writing of the authors, can provide models for children's composition. How effective the models are remains to be explored. The English Curriculum Study Center of the University of Georgia undertook a study on the effect of the use of literary models in teaching written composition in kindergarten through the sixth grade (1968). Their conclusion was that a systematic approach using models for selected purposes worked better than incidental classroom contact with literature.

A study done with older students by Sponsler (1971) showed that the use of literary models to improve written composition was not completely effective. In this case, however, the treatment consisted of only two lessons with literary models. Contact over a longer period of time might well show more positive results.

Pinkham (1968) used a "model of literature" approach and tested it with fifth graders. She devised a general pattern so that there would be consistency of approach. The assumption of the study was that a series of lessons consisting of a number of creative writing periods, motivated by hearing, discussing, and evaluating

selected works from the field of children's literature, would stimulate pupils to produce better written expression.

Each lesson consisted of the following major steps: (1) listening to the selections; (2) discussing writing techniques as reflected by the selections; (3) reading and discussing pertinent portions of the selections which illustrated the specific aims of the lesson; (4) participating in creative writing exercises using the techniques discussed; and (5) evaluating and rewriting in a later period after correction of the exercises, using for the students' written expression the same procedures described in steps 1-4. The lessons were constructed so that all areas of the language arts were used to enrich the writing effort and so that other recognized approaches to the improvement of composition—actual and vicarious experiences, practice in writing, and rewriting following evaluation—were utilized.

Pinkham's study was thorough and the results are encouraging. Her series of lessons was instrumental, to some extent, in developing ability in written expression in fifth-grade pupils, particularly in those areas evaluated by the STEP Writing Test and more particularly in the case of urban children.

Research results indicate that language skills, while interrelated, are not reciprocal. Cox (1971) found that this was true of the language skills used by young children in spontaneous expression, in the presentation of dictation, and in personal authorship. It should not be surprising, then, that contact with children's literature does not automatically lead to improved writing.

Use of intermediate steps. The studies of the use of literary models have been most successful when intermediate steps were taken between the contact with literature and the writing experience.

Lundsteen (1976) has developed a framework for the teaching-learning process in composition that may offer some concrete suggestions for intermediate steps and step-by-step strategies in teaching composition through literature. She has labeled the seven parts to the model or framework (1) stimuli of impressions, (2) re-creation, (3) creative problem, (4) oral consultation, (5) written consultation, (6) sharing compositions (orally) for public display, and (7) written composition for public display.

After the use of examples from literature as the stimuli of impressions, similar examples could be re-created from the child's own experience. If a child has read or heard a story about an adventure in an eerie setting, then the child may recall an adventure in the dark, perhaps as the result of an electric power failure. The child

can be encouraged to act out impressions, feelings, and solutions. The next step would be to see the situation as a writing problem, one which calls for a creative solution to be worked out on paper. The idea for a story is taking shape. The child next begins to test out the idea on others, on classmates or the teacher. Oral consultation helps clarify the idea, and the child is ready to write. The process of written consultation adds to the refining of the story product. Rewriting may occur, or the need for self-expression may be satisfied by the first draft.

For a child who wants to share the written product, the next step can be an oral sharing of the story with an audience. The final step, making the written product available for public reading, involves dressing up or polishing the story so that it can take its place as a part of the literature of the classroom.

Giving the experience of the intermediate steps suggested by Lundsteen and the dignity of purpose in the final step may be an important teaching strategy in the improvement of writing through the use of literature models. These suggestions do not mean that we lock children into following adult literary models and adopt arbitrary "cookbook" prescriptions for the writing process. The program can still be intensely individual and based on what we know, developmentally speaking, about writing that is done by children.

O'Dea (1965) refers to the notion that "students learn to write well by reading great literature" as a myth. Yet he says that in most myths there is some degree of truth. He explains, "Certainly there is a good deal of truth in the assumption that those who read widely are rewarded in several ways, one of which is increased proficiency in writing. . . . Just how this happens, we do not yet know" (p. 328). O'Dea suggests that the model provided in class is often not clearly related to the writing assignment. It would stand to reason that a better understanding of the interrelationship between reading and writing is needed both by teachers and by students. The relationships need to be made clear. The intermediate steps between exposure to literature and writing need to be investigated further. The question becomes, What causes students to internalize ideas from literature and in turn try them in their own writing?

Use of key questions. Pinkham (1968) recommends that an approach be based on the idea of key questions developed from literature: "Since children have been using the method of inquiry in other subject matter areas, it might prove effective to apply problem-solving techniques to the discovery of ways to communicate in writing" (p. 124).

The Foundation for Future Work

The studies of Pinkham and the University of Georgia Curriculum Study Center give a foundation to build on. The Nebraska Curriculum for English (1966) should also be considered. In this comprehensive program, children's composition was an important element of each unit in which a literary selection was used as a stimulus. In Tway's study (1970), the elements of fiction are those focused on for the evaluation of writing. The elements are the same, for literature *is* creative writing.

Memering (1971) claims that literature-based programs in the past have offered the student no general strategy for writing. This is no doubt a valid claim, at least generally speaking. Pinkham (1968), however, has carefully worked out a strategy for intermediate-grade children. The literary selections for her study were chosen to demonstrate the following aims of written expression: (1) to communicate effectively by means of the written word; (2) to use a style of writing suitable for the message to be communicated; (3) to promote the growth of writing vocabulary and skill in the use of words; (4) to develop knowledge of the type of organization suitable for various kinds of writing; and (5) to make use of original ideas in written expression. Each general aim was further delineated and subdivided into specific aims.

The first aim, "to communicate effectively by means of the written word," is illustrated in one instance by a passage from *The Wonderful Adventure of Nils* (Lagerlof, 1907). In the story, the appearance of an elf distracts Nils (a Norwegian farm boy), who catches the little fellow and treats him so unkindly that the elf reduces Nils, without his realizing the change, to miniature size.

In the passage selected, Nils discovers this frightening fact. The author does not make any statement of what has happened. The idea is communicated to the reader by a series of descriptions of Nils' actions. For example, Nils "clambers up" a chair upon which he had been sitting comfortably a moment before. Pinkham explains that the child would be led to see that these descriptions of actions communicate to the reader Nils' reduction in size much more effectively than a simple statement of fact, since the reader is presented with action picture after action picture, each of which emphasizes the contrast in size between Nils and everyday objects.

The kind of discussion and clarification which was utilized in Pinkham's study has important implications. Certainly, if students can be led to see what happens in literature "actively" as they can be led to see the effect of Nils' reduction in size, this strategy should be more effective than a statement of fact about literary values.

Selecting literature to serve as models. Pinkham's study includes the list of selections used, as does the University of Georgia curriculum study report (1968). These are excellent sources for teachers and researchers interested in good literary models. The compilation of resource materials for the Georgia study was based on the assumptions that the desire to write frequently results from the enjoyment and stimulation derived from the reading of what another has written, that children's literature offers the child contact with master writers, and that this contact may be systematically encouraged and developed by teachers.

Tway (1970) lists twelve elements of fiction and suggests that teachers can use specific children's books to illustrate the various elements. A chart is given as an example:

Examples of Books for Children which Can Be Used for Discussion of Elements of Fiction

Brown, Marcia	*Once a Mouse*	Values
Lawson, Robert	*Rabbit Hill*	Sentence Structure
Lenski, Lois	*Strawberry Girl*	Conversation (Dialect)
Lionni, Leo	*Swimmy*	Word Usage
McCloskey, Robert	*Blueberries for Sal*	Structure
Ormondroyd, Edward	*Time at the Top*	Situation
Stolz, Mary	*A Dog on Barkham Street* and *The Bully of Barkham Street*	Point of View (Contrast)
White, E.B.	*Charlotte's Web* and *Stuart Little*	Ending (Contrast)
Wilder, Laura Ingalls	*Little House in the Big Woods*	Detail and Appeals to Senses
	Little House on the Prairie	Setting
Yashima, Taro	*Crow Boy*	Characterization

A look to the future. Hillerich (1973) says that "while we rightly cry for more research dealing with the improvement of written expression, we already know more than we use" (p. 2). It is important that teachers not give up in the face of inadequate research findings. There is more than enough to go on, as evidenced by some of the studies cited above. Teachers can proceed, experimentally perhaps, but with confidence that the relationships between composition and literature are strong and irrefutable.

The language experience approach (LEA), in which beginning reading and writing are developed together, holds much promise. Research already supports the LEA as superior in many respects to other approaches (see Cramer, 1968; Peaster, 1970; Stauffer & Hammond, 1968).

Other research shows that a special literature program can aid the oral language expansion of linguistically different children (Strickland, 1971). Since oral experience and facility with language is a prerequisite to written language, the early use of literary models through daily storytime should indirectly lead to improved writing.

Some cautions about using literature as models for writing are in order, however. First, the model should not be made to seem like an impossible goal. The students must not be left to feel that they are far short of the goal and can never reach it. Second, when children are encouraged to model their writing after someone else's, it should not be regarded as a copying of ideas, but rather as a sharing process. The children should be encouraged to build on the ideas gained and give the ideas their own interpretation and treatment.

Recommendations

In order to guide children's writing growth, teachers themselves need much experience in writing. To use literary models more effectively, teachers need a wide knowledge of children's literature. It is important that teacher preparation programs provide more of these experiences. Education departments in colleges and universities must evaluate their programs in light of these priorities, and research must provide the necessary justification for these improvements.

Continuing evaluation of teacher preparation programs in order to meet children's educational needs is as important as evaluation by teachers of children's progress in the classroom, another important way in which teachers can guide children's writing growth. This process of evaluation in the classroom is the topic of the next chapter.

REFERENCES

Cox, V.E.L. "Reciprocal Oracy/Literacy Recognition Skills in the Language Production of Language Experience Approach Students" (Doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona, 1971). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1972, *32*, 2905A. (University Microfilms No. 72-01707)

Cramer, R.L. "An Investigation of the Spelling Achievement of Two Groups of First-Grade Classes on Phonologically Regular and Irregular Words and in Written Composition" (Doctoral dissertation, University of Delaware, 1968). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1968, *29*, 1357A. (University Microfilms No. 68-15531) [ED 037 442]

English Curriculum Study Center. *The Use of Literary Models in Teaching Written Composition Grades K-6*. Athens: University of Georgia, 1968. [ED 026 365]

Hillerich, R.L. "Evaluating Process and Product in Children's Writing." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, Philadelphia, 1973.

Lundsteen, S.W. *Children Learn to Communicate: Language Arts through Creative Problem Solving*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1976. (Chapter 7, "How to Teach Composition")

Memering, W.D. "Recent Theories and Practices in the Teaching of Composition" (Doctoral dissertation, The Florida State University, 1971). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1972, *32*, 3260A. (University Microfilms No. 72-00275)

Nebraska Curriculum Development Center. *A Curriculum for English*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1966. [ED 013 806-ED 013 811]

O'Dea, P. "Five Myths in the Teaching of Composition." *English Journal*, 1965, *54*, 328-330.

Peaster, M.Y. "A Descriptive Analysis of Beginning Reading Combining Language Experiences, Children's Story Writing, and Linguistic Principles Tested after the Second and the Third Year" (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1970). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1971, *31*, 5913A. (University Microfilms No. 71-11348) [ED 054 154]

Pinkham, R.G. "The Effect on the Written Expression of Fifth-Grade Pupils of a Series of Lessons Emphasizing the Characteristics of Good Writing as Exemplified in Selected Works from the Area of Children's Literature" (Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1968). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1969, *29*, 2613A. (University Microfilms No. 69-02168)

Sponsler, M.G.C. "The Effectiveness of Literary Models in the Teaching of Written Composition" (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1971). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1971, *32*, 2322A. (University Microfilms No. 71-23983)

Stauffer, R.G., & Hammond, W.D. *The Effectiveness of Language Arts and Basic Reader Approaches to First-Grade Reading Instruction—Extended into Third Grade* (Final report). Newark: University of Delaware, 1968. [ED 027 163]

Strickland, D.S. "The Effects of a Special Literature Program on the Oral Language Expansion of Linguistically Different, Negro, Kindergarten Children" (Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1971). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1971, *32*, 1406A. (University Microfilms No. 71-24816)

Tway, D.E. "A Study of the Feasibility of Training Teachers to Use the 'Literary Rating Scale' in Evaluating Children's Fiction Writing" (Doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University, 1970). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1971, *31*, 5918A. (University Microfilms No. 71-10997) [ED 053 139]

6 The Challenge of Evaluation

Evaluation of children's writing is a topic that will challenge or threaten, depending on the evaluator's personal philosophy. It is usually a challenging topic to educators or researchers, for they need to find ways to measure children's growth in writing. Yet sometimes the challenge is avoided—or not met face on—because it is a difficult one. To evaluate something as personal and complex as writing is not a simple matter.

Some highly artistic people, such as the authors of children's books, see the evaluation of children's writing as a threat (Tway, 1970). They fear that creativity in writing will be red-penciled or analyzed with stifling results. Other interested people say it is impossible to measure something as intangible as writing. Yet writing is tangible in its product form, and adult critics have found ways to evaluate adult literature. It should be possible to evaluate children's writings, too. Ebel (1967) suggests that every important outcome of education can be measured.

Certainly, the importance of personal writing in the elementary school is established. How to "measure" progress in personal writing is not as clearly established. In *Growth through English* Dixon asks, "How can a teacher help pupils engaged in so personal a task as writing to weigh up what has been achieved?" (1967, p. 8). Research attempts to answer this question have been limited. Aside from composition scales in which a series of graded paragraphs or passages is used as a standard to go by, there are few guidelines in the literature for teachers. The professional literature suggests an abundance of ways to encourage children to write but does not have nearly as much on how to evaluate what is written.

Methods of Evaluation

Rating methods. Of course, some writers about children's writings do offer help in both stimulation and evaluation. Carlson's

Originality Story Scale, in her book *Sparkling Words* (1973), provides suggestions for standards to use in evaluation. Besides Carlson, researchers who have developed scales for use in various areas include Torrance (originality and interest, 1964), Duffy (poetry), and Tway (fiction writing, 1970). The Tway scale is a general one to assess overall quality of a story. Twelve elements of fiction are described in the scale and examples are provided from children's writings. This is a useful guide for researchers who need greater familiarity with children's actual written performance (see chapter 5).

Rating methods that have proved useful in research have been developed by Diederich (1964), Hunt (1965), and O'Donnell, Griffin, and Norris (1967). Although it was developed originally for high school and college compositions, the Diederich scale has been found to be generally applicable for elementary composition. It is divided into two factors, a "general goodness" factor and a distinct mechanics factor. Each of these factors is subdivided:

General Merit
- Quality and development of ideas
- Organization, relevance, movement
- Style, flavor, individuality
- Wording and phrasing

Mechanics
- Grammar, sentence structure
- Punctuation, capitals
- Spelling
- Handwriting, neatness.

The Diederich scale represents an evaluation method that is both qualitative and quantitative, that is, the scale provides for assessing both the quality of ideas and style and the quantitative amount of "correctness" in such things as grammar, punctuation, and spelling. It is rare to find both factors in a scale. This broad applicability of the Diederich scale has, of course, added to its usefulness.

Hunt's (1965) method of measuring the maturity of writing is a quantitative one. It involves a way of discovering the use of subordinations and longer clauses. Hunt's method ignores punctuation and divides the composition that is being evaluated into the smallest possible units, each unit consisting of only one main clause and its modifiers, if any. In this way, the evaluator eliminates all com-

pound sentences, and the composition becomes a sequence of simple and complex sentences. Hunt called these units "minimal terminable units" or T-units. In evaluating a child's composition, a researcher counts the number of T-units used as well as the average number of words per T-unit.

Hunt gives an example of a fourth grader's theme written as one long sentence without benefit of punctuation.

> I like the movie we saw about Moby Dick the white whale the captain said if you can kill the white whale Moby Dick I will give this gold to the one that can do it and it is worth sixteen dollars they tried and tried but while they were trying they killed a whale and used the oil for the lamps they almost caught the white whale (1965, p. 20)

Hunt's division of the theme into the shortest grammatically allowable sentences reveals six T-units.

1. I like the movie we saw about Moby Dick, the white whale.
2. The captain said if you can kill the white whale, Moby Dick, I will give this gold to the one that can do it.
3. And it is worth sixteen dollars.
4. They tried and tried.
5. But while they were trying they killed a whale and used the oil for the lamps.
6. They almost caught the white whale.

Hunt found that the T-unit was a promising index of maturity, since the average main clause written by successively older students has more subordinate clauses attached to it and the clauses themselves become longer.

A study by O'Donnell et al. (1967) supported Hunt's findings that the T-unit is a simple, objective, valid indicator of development in syntactic control. Both studies established norms for several different grade levels, with the O'Donnell study establishing norms for somewhat younger children than the Hunt study.

The mean word length of T-units seems to be an effective way of measuring maturity in handling syntactic structures. Yet the art of writing involves more than skill in syntactic control. To stop with measuring syntax alone would leave other important areas of evaluation untouched. The T-unit needs to be complemented with qualitative measures, depending on the objectives of researchers.

While Hunt's quantitative method has proved useful, other quantitative methods have been too simple for a complicated task. For example, the mere count of simple sentences in proportion to complex sentences used in writing did not prove an adequate measure, according to Wiggins (1968).

Roger McCaig (1972) and his colleagues developed the meaning unit, or M-unit, which they felt reflected the purpose of the child, especially the very young child, more than did Hunt's T-unit. They felt that the M-unit could be used to evaluate the writing of children as young as first graders. According to McCaig,

> an M-unit may be defined as a word or a group of words in children's writing which can be reconstructed into a sentence in accordance with a judgment about the child's intention. The judgment is to be made by a reader who is familiar with the writing of children of the same age and ethnic background as the writer. (p. 7)

An example of first-grade writing reconstructed into an M-unit is, *Im gnu bren sum rock home = I'm going to bring some rocks home.*

The problem of objectivity in evaluating something as complex as personal writing is further complicated in using the M-unit, for the evaluation depends on what the reconstructor judges the intent of the writer to be.

McCaig maintains that "if the foundation for the evaluation system is a developmental view of learning rather than a foreign standard of writing, then a greater value will be placed on experimenting with higher stages of development than on rehearsing behaviors already mastered" (p. 5). This view suggests that the emphasis in evaluation should be placed on quality of ideas and content rather than on correctness of form.

Self-evaluation. Researchers at the English Curriculum Study Center (1968) of the University of Georgia define evaluation as the process for determining the degree of change taking place in writers, as specified by their objectives for writing. They state that evaluation involves the kind and length of behavioral change, the quantity and quality of the writer's use of knowledge and skill in the areas defined by the objectives, and attitudes toward any aspect of the writing act (p. viii). These researchers further maintain that writers under guidance can learn to analyze, criticize, improve, and control their own writing behavior, and they suggest that teachers make a conscious effort to provide opportunities for self-evaluation. In doing this, however, teachers must be careful to help young writers feel satisfaction in monitoring their own progress.

Self-evaluation opens a whole new area in the evaluation of children's writings. It would seem to be an important aspect for investigation. Yet, if San Jose's (1973) study is any indication, children's self-evaluation will complicate the already troublesome areas of quantitative versus qualitative evaluation. San Jose, building on Hunt's work, found that in interviewing fourth-grade children it was clear that their preferences and self-evaluations had very little to do with the evaluations of experienced graders, and even less to do with the complexity of their syntax. No significant statistical relationship was found between syntactic complexity and superiority in content as judged by experienced raters or as judged by the children themselves. Superiority in content was often interpreted differently by the children than it was by the adult raters.

Thus, self-evaluation adds another dimension to the evaluation of writing. For researchers who want to use children's self-evaluation, some help is already available. A scale developed by Sager (1973) has been found to be reliable when used by middle-grade children to rate their own compositions.

Measuring young children's writing. Pinkham (1968), in using lessons from children's literature to stimulate creative writing, found the STEP Writing Test, Form A, to be useful in evaluating written expression. This test is organized into five main areas: organization, conventions, critical thinking, effectiveness, and appropriateness. These areas can be important categories to use in examining the writing of children who are beginning to be fluent. However, Pinkham concluded that a simple instrument for the evaluation of the written expression of younger children is a need which might be fulfilled by a future researcher. For the present, according to Pinkham, the lack is a detriment to those who would experiment in discovering means of improving the written expression of young children.

Process and Product

Evaluating the process. Hillerich (1973) suggests that both the process and the product should be evaluated. Certainly the process is equally important, if not more so, than the product to the elementary school child. Children should experience satisfaction in the writing act itself. Conditions under which the process occurs have tremendous influence on whether the product will be imaginative and free or mundane and stilted. Graves (1974) found that whether or not the writing process is self-instigated is a factor in the resulting quality of the product.

A study by Sawkins (1971) was undertaken to investigate approaches fifth-grade children follow when writing narrative compositions. Using the interview technique, Sawkins found some interesting generalizations about the process children go through in writing. Among the findings which have implications for further research are the following: (1) more able writers tend to be concerned with the content; (2) less able writers tend to be concerned with the mechanics; (3) aspects of content are considered before and during the writing, but reasons given for proofreading and rewriting are related to the mechanics; and (4) ability to discuss the writing process is not necessarily reflected in the quality of the writing.

Researchers planning to evaluate process need to consider whether or not they might try some kind of intervention treatment in order to help children integrate content and form, including mechanics. It would also be wise to consider some problems inherent in Sawkins's fourth finding. Some questions to consider would include the following: Would a child who has insight into the writing process do better in the long run? Would a longitudinal study show that ability to discuss the writing process is reflected in the quality of the writing, after all? Would the kind of writing involved make a difference in the relationship between quality of product and ability to discuss the process?

Evaluating the product. For those researchers and teachers interested in evaluating the product, Owens (1972) makes a simple suggestion that is not new but that is still surprisingly neglected in elementary studies. His recommendation for situations in which several judges or raters are asked to evaluate compositions is to establish five or six simple criteria ahead of time so that the judges are rating the same factors. Existing scales can also be used.

Raters' comments on children's compositions can have a subsequent effect on later products, according to a study by Gee (1970). However, only positive comments seem to have a positive effect. Gee's results support some earlier studies which found that comments of praise were more effective than criticism or no comment in developing positive attitudes toward writing. There were no significant differences between the effects of criticism and no-comment treatments. Thus, if raters cannot comment positively, they may as well not comment at all! Gee concluded that it will likely be through studies of isolated variables such as the effect of feedback that some answers to the question of how best to improve student writing will come.

Gee's study, although conducted with older students (high school), seems to have important implications for the feedback which evaluators give regarding the products of younger students. Whether the feedback effect is central to the research study or a "fringe benefit," it will be important to students. A total positive approach, not an isolated feature approach, will be, of course, the desired result in the classroom.

In evaluating the stories of younger children (and perhaps those of older children as well), it may be that a global impression of the overall quality of a story is as effective or more so than a detailed quantitative analysis. Surely, global impressions of the whole story should complement any analysis of parts or features, lest the evaluation represent a fragmented view.

Roger McCaig points out, "A system of evaluation does not exist by itself. It exists only as part of a framework of beliefs about living, learning, and growing" (p. 6). Researchers and teachers concerned with improving children's writings need first to determine priorities and objectives for the writing program. Then they can base evaluation on whether or not priorities and objectives are being met. No longer will "foreign standards," as McCaig calls them, be brought to bear. Evaluation seems to be a key part to improvement of research in writing. If evaluation techniques and tools are improved, then researchers will be that much farther on the way to better research in writing.

Needed Tools for Evaluation

Researchers in the area of composition need a wide array of tools for evaluation at hand, if they are to evaluate their own work successfully. If research is conducted to determine ways to improve writing, then some effective "tool" or method, and perhaps many methods, will be needed to ensure the proper determination of improvement. The necessary tools include (1) methods to assess process as well as product, (2) methods to assess qualitative as well as quantitative improvement, (3) methods to assess the works of younger children as well as those of older children, and (4) methods to assess different forms of writing, such as prose-fact, prose-fiction, and poetry.

The method or methods of evaluation should be chosen to fit the objectives of the evaluation. For research, evaluation should no doubt be more broadly based than it has been in the past. Mehaffie (1971) recommended that evaluation of composition should have an interdisciplinary foundation, because such a broad approach may accommodate the complexity of the many dimen-

sions of evaluating student writing. Two of the dimensions of process which Mehaffie considers are experience and communication. As the dimensions become blended, so must the evaluation methods.

Considerations for Improving Research

As researchers continue to try to improve their own methods of evaluation, they will find the following considerations helpful, not only to the authenticity of their research but also to the teachers and students who benefit from their research:

1. Evaluation should be integral to the larger framework of philosophical and psychological beliefs about education.
2. Evaluation should not be deterministic and limiting to children and teachers.
3. Evaluation should take into account the child's standards along with the adult's standards.
4. Evaluation should stress the finding of values in writing rather than the criticism of weaknesses.

The above guidelines or considerations should place *value* in its rightful place in evaluation. Values are continually operating, whether in the reading or the composing of written expression. Evaluation of writing can never be completely objective, nor perhaps should it be, for writing is a personal expression and never completely objective in itself. A dynamic, comprehensive interpretation of children's writing needs to include considerations of emotional and intellectual development along with linguistic maturity. Researchers need to be aware of their own philosophical and psychological value systems and of how these fit the larger framework of educational goals in which evaluation takes place. Balancing these sensitivities is perhaps the biggest challenge of evaluation.

Appropriate evaluation, of course, is at the heart of research on composition, or research on any other area. Does modern methodology and expertise from the behavioral sciences have more ideas to offer to researchers in this field of writing? The next chapter addresses itself to this topic.

REFERENCES

Carlson, R.K. *Sparkling Words: Two Hundred and Twenty-five Practical and Creative Writing Ideas* (Rev. ed.). Berkeley, Calif.: Wagner Publishing Company, 1973. (Distributed by NCTE) [ED 018 417]

Diederich, P.B. "Problems and Possibilities of Research in the Teaching of Written Composition." In *Research Design and the Teaching of English.* Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1964. [ED 001 917]

Dixon, J. *Growth through English.* Reading, England: National Association for the Teaching of English, 1967. (Distributed by NCTE) [ED 014 491]

Duffy, G. *An Analytical Scale for Measuring the Semantic Novelty of Poems.* Unpublished manuscript, Michigan State University, n.d.

Ebel, R.L. "Measurement and the Teacher." In D.A. Payne & R.F. McMorris (Eds.), *Educational and Psychological Measurement.* Waltham, Mass.: Blaisdell, 1967.

English Curriculum Study Center. *The Use of Literary Models In Teaching Written Composition Grades K-6.* Athens: University of Georgia, 1968. [ED 026 365]

Gee, T.C. "The Effects of Written Comment on Expository Composition" (Doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, 1970). *Dissertation Abstracts International,* 1971, *31,* 3412A. (University Microfilms No. 71-00551)

Graves, D.H. "Children's Writing: Research Directions and Hypotheses Based upon an Examination of the Writing Processes of Seven-Year-Old Children" (Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1974). *Dissertation Abstracts International,* 1974, *34,* 6255A. (University Microfilms No. 74-08375) [ED 095 586]

Hillerich, R.L. "Evaluating Process and Product in Children's Writing." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, Philadelphia, 1973.

Hunt, K.W. *Grammatical Structures Written at Three Grade Levels* (Research Report No. 3). Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, Committee on Research, 1965.

McCaig, R.A. *The Writing of Elementary School Children: A Model for Evaluation.* Grosse Pointe, Mich.: Grosse Pointe Public School System, 1972.

Mehaffie, S. "Composition Evaluation: Historical Background and an Applied Theory" (Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 1971). *Dissertation Abstracts International,* 1972, *32,* 6294A. (University Microfilms No. 72-15803)

O'Donnell, R.C., Griffin, W.J., & Norris, R.C. *Syntax of Kindergarten and Elementary School Children* (Research Report No. 8). Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, Committee on Research, 1967.

Owens, F.L. "A Study of Creative Writing Ability of Third-Grade Students in a Communication Skills through Authorship Program" (Doctoral dissertation, University of Idaho, 1972). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1972, *33*, 3485A. (University Microfilms No. 72-32838)

Pinkham, R.G. "The Effect on the Written Expression of Fifth-Grade Pupils of a Series of Lessons Emphasizing the Characteristics of Good Writing as Exemplified in Selected Works from the Area of Children's Literature" (Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1968). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1969, *29*, 2613A. (University Microfilms No. 69-02168)

Sager, C. "Improving the Quality of Written Composition through Pupil Use of Rating Scale" (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University, 1973). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1973, *34*, 1496A. (University Microfilms No. 73-23605) [ED 089 304]

San Jose, C.P.M. *Grammatical Structures in Four Modes of Writing at the Fourth-Grade Level*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Syracuse University, 1973.

Sawkins, M.W. "The Oral Responses of Selected Fifth-Grade Children to Questions Concerning Their Written Expression" (Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1971). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1971, *31*, 6287A. (University Microfilms No. 71-16463) [ED 057 046]

Torrance, E.P. "Supplementary Scoring Guide for the Evaluation of Originality and Interest." In K. Yamamoto, *Experimental Scoring Manuals for Minnesota Tests of Creative Thinking and Writing*. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University, Bureau of Educational Research, 1964. [ED 017 090]

Tway, D.E. "A Study of the Feasibility of Training Teachers to Use the 'Literary Rating Scale' in Evaluating Children's Fiction Writing" (Doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University, 1970). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1971, *31*, 5918A. (University Microfilms No. 71-10997) [ED 053 139]

Wiggins, R.F. "A Study of the Influence of Oral Instruction on Students' Ability in Written Sentence Structure" (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1968). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1969, *29*, 3927A. (University Microfilms No. 69-05819) [ED 040 189]

7 Research Perspectives from the Behavioral Sciences: Some New (And Not So New) Directions

The researcher, when deciding on the appropriate methodology for investigating a problem, must first and foremost consider the nature of the problem. Methodology may be evaluated by other criteria, such as precision, efficiency, objectivity, cost, and feasibility. But methodology is a tool, and we judge any tool by how well it serves our needs.

What are the research needs in English composition? It is hard at present to answer with desired precision. Even those researchers intimately connected with the area seem to be "looking through a glass darkly." But English composition is, among other things, an educational matter, a topic for instruction in schools. And the commonality of needs in other areas of educational research suggests that composition is not all that different.

In brief, I propose that we need (1) better information about instructional substance and practice in actual classrooms, (2) more adequate methods of assessing composition skills, (3) more efficient and robust techniques for experimental evaluation of curriculum programs and teacher-training programs, and (4) more systematic and theoretically based research on the mental processes and cognitive skills that are acquired while "learning to write well." In sum, we need basic research that is analytic and relevant, that can provide fairly immediate answers to practical questions about assessment and skill development.

This is a large order, but existing methodology meets all of these needs. We have the tools; it is a question of training researchers to do a creative job with the available tools. Let me now try to justify this claim.

Using available tools and methodologies. Whether a research question is descriptive (what is happening) or prescriptive (what are the most reasonable courses of action), methodology should

yield outcomes that are *objective, generalizable,* and *multivariate.* In addition, for prescriptive research, methodology should permit causal rather than correlational outcomes. This generally means *experiments. Objective* means that results are reproducible within tolerable limits; we understand what was done and the conditions under which the evidence was obtained. *Generalizable* means that we can estimate the possible effects of contextual variation on a set of results. If a study is replicated in a different situation, we can predict how large a change in the results to expect. *Multivariate* implies complexity. The input-output relations of an English composition are complex. We need to provide for identification and measurement of multiple features of a writer's environment and multiple aspects of the writer's responses. Finally, *experimental* means that the experimenter exerts active control over those features of the situation that are likely to affect performance.

In general and in specific instances, the behavioral sciences possess procedures and analytic tools to meet these requirements. To be sure, researchers who have chosen to study English composition may have to range over many disciplines to collect the necessary tools. They may borrow survey methods from sociology, factor analysis and multiple regression from test theory and educational psychology, and fractional factorial designs from agricultural and industrial statistics. At the same time, they will have to avoid the pitfalls of standardized, norm-referenced tests and the confounding influences present in Method A/Method B designs. They must shake off the rapturous dependence upon massive print-outs from high speed digital computers. These temptations are the more dangerous because they cannot be entirely avoided. But whether the task is basic or applied research, the investigator has at his or her disposal powerful and informative methodological tools (Amick & Walberg, 1975; Cronbach, Gleser, Nanda, & Rajaratuam, 1972; Kerlinger, 1973; Kerlinger & Pedhazur, 1973; Kirk, 1968; Winer, 1971, Wittrock & Wiley, 1970).

Unique concerns for researchers of composition. To be sure, some unique problems confront the researcher of English composition. The most significant of these is the character of the "response." Aside from relatively trivial details such as "good grammar" and the like, a composition is a creative production. How shall a composition be judged in an objective, reliable, and informative fashion? Machine scored, multiple-choice questions seem to miss the point.

At present, we rely chiefly on human judgment to evaluate a composition. A person with suitable training and experience, fol-

lowing more or less clearcut criteria, must read the composition and judge its merits in selected technical and nontechnical categories. The process is time consuming, arduous, and subject to variation, dependent on the expertise and standards of the judge. This is a *measurement* problem, not simply a matter of rater reliability in assigning numbers. Human raters are the best "detectors" of the dimensions of quality of a composition, and the task remains of uncovering the dimensions and criteria that can guide thoughtful readers in their evaluation of compositions. What is in the minds of the readers as they delight or despair? Relatively little work has been directed toward this matter, which is of fundamental importance in the assessment of English composition (Carroll & Freedle, 1972). [*Editor's Note:* Also see Mellon (1975), who found in the National Assessment that both the performance and the evaluation of some writing exercises were complicated by the fact that they called not only for composing but also for such cognitive operations as maintaining an assigned role.]

A second unique aspect of research in composition is the importance of the writer's individuality and the developmental influences that contribute to that individuality. In much educational research, "individual differences" refers to statistical scatter in a collection of univariate measures. In composition, the individual's style in approaching and combining a variety of writing tasks is fundamental.

The clamor for case-study investigations in English education is not always a thoughtful response, but it is quite possible that this paradigm is needed for the study of writing style. Rigorous, generalizable research is feasible with the case-study model, and this paradigm provides answers to significant questions that are missed by other techniques. A case study entails the intensive investigation of one or more individuals.

Longitudinal data, the record of months and years, may be essential for accurate characterization of individuals. Study of a single individual, sometimes called an N = 1 study, serves certain purposes. Where the individual is of note *per se*, as in the case of biographical studies of a famous person, the rationale is clearcut. And where the phenomenon under investigation is relatively stable and unchanging from one individual to the next, as in psychological investigations of sensory functioning, the N = 1 case study serves quite adequately. But for generalization, it is essential that diverse individuals be included in a study. Linguistic diary studies reveal the limitation of the case study of a single person when individual differences are large. Weir's (1962) case study is a tour de force, but

it illustrates the point: the degree of typicality in one child's linguistic development is questionable. When a substantial investment in investigative time and effort is required for each individual in a study, it behooves investigators to select their subjects so as to yield the largest amount of useful information. Various sampling designs are useful in this respect; so-called fractional designs (Calfee, 1975) are exceptionally efficient. We have proposed these procedures for studies of the acquisition of beginning reading and for improving classroom practices of teachers. In both of these designs, relatively small numbers of subjects (N is less than 50) are intensively studied over one or more school years The subjects are selected so that a large number of potentially significant sources of individual differences are controlled by the sampling technique. This procedure, which combines the generalizability features of large-scale survey designs with the data-intensive features of a case study, seems to be especially well suited to the needs of composition research.

A pooling of talents. Research is a human enterprise and as such reflects the interests and abilities of those who engage in it. The analytic, objective rigor of the behavioral scientist seems to contradict the synthesizing, subjective imaginativeness of the artist in English education. I am not sure that the gap between artist and scientist is a good analogy for describing the characteristics and preferences of those scholars who choose English over, say, educational psychology. But it does appear to me that training in research skills and methodological expertise is often inversely related to the demands of the problems faced by a scholar. I sense considerable frustration on the part of English education researchers, particularly the younger ones, as they view the magnitude of the research problems confronting them and compare these to the modest and poorly understood methodologies at their disposal. This is not to belittle the substantial skills of their primary discipline. Quite the contrary. The challenge, as in many areas of education, is to extend and elevate the research skills available to each individual and to facilitate the pooling of diverse talents. Movement along these lines, not the evolution of novel methodological procedures, will lead to improvements in research in English education generally, and in composition in particular.

REFERENCES

Amick, D.J., & Walberg, H.J. (Eds.). *Introductory Multivariate Analysis for Educational, Psychological and Social Research*. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan Publishing Company, 1975.

Calfee, R.C. "The Design of Experiments and the Design of Curriculum." In L. Mosberg (Ed.), *Curriculum, Instruction and Learning: First Annual Symposium*. Newark: University of Delaware, 1975.

Carroll, J.B., & Freedle, R.O. (Eds.). *Language Comprehension and the Acquisition of Knowledge*. Washington, D.C.: V.H. Winston & Sons, 1972. [ED 068 925]

Cronbach, L.J., Gleser, G.C., Nanda, H., & Rajaratuam, N. *The Dependability of Behavioral Measurements: Theory of Generalizability for Scores and Profiles*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1972. [ED 014 766]

Kerlinger, F.N. *Foundations of Behavioral Research* (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.

Kerlinger, F.N., & Pedhazur, E.J. *Multiple Regression in Behavioral Research*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.

Kirk, R.E. *Experimental Design: Procedures for the Behavioral Sciences*. Belmont, Calif.: Brooks/Cole, 1968.

Mellon, J.C. *National Assessment and the Teaching of English*. Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1975.

Weir, R.H. *Language in the Crib*. The Hague: Mouton & Company, 1962.

Winer, B.J. *Statistical Principles in Experimental Design* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Wittrock, M.C., & Wiley, D.E. *The Evaluation of Instruction: Issues and Problems*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

Appendix A

Projects Dealing with Composition NCTE Research Foundation

The following projects dealing with composition have received grants from the NCTE Research Foundation:

Loren V. Grissom, Research on the Effect of Incorporating Student Participation in the Evaluation of Writing Quality, February 1963.

James McCrimmon, Conference on Elementary Composition, November 1966.

Donald C. Stewart, Research on the Nature and History of the Freshman Anthology in the English Composition Course, February 1967.

Colorado Springs Conference on Composing Process, November 1968.

Judithe Speidel, Research on Using Art to Teach Writing (An Experiment in Transfer or Perceptual Training), November 1968.

Richard Adler, Assistance in Computer Analysis of the Results of His Questionnaire Study of Student Compositions, April 1971.

Theone Hughes, Research on Syntactic Maturity in Children's Writing (A Cross-Cultural Study), November 1975.

A. Harris Fairbanks, Research on the Effectiveness of an Interdisciplinary Research Committee on the Teaching of Composition, January 1976.

Appendix B

Projects Dealing with Composition
NCTE Promising Researchers

Edward A. Dixon, Chicago City College, Olive-Harvey Campus, Department of English. Dissertation at the University of Chicago under the direction of Professor Robert Rippey: "Syntactic Indexes and Student Writing Performances," 1971.

Frank O'Hare, Florida State University, College of Education. Dissertation at Florida State University, Tallahassee, under the direction of Professor John S. Simmons: "The Effect of Sentence-Combining Practice Not Dependent on Formal Knowledge of a Grammar on the Writing of Seventh Graders," 1971.

Carol Sager, Wilmington Public Schools, Wilmington, Mass., Director of Reading. Dissertation at Boston University under the direction of Professor B. Alice Crossley: "Improving the Quality of Written Composition Through Pupil Use of a Rating Scale," 1973.

Christine Martinez San Jose, Syracuse University, Reading and Language Arts Center. Dissertation at Syracuse University under the direction of Professor Margaret J. Early: "Grammatical Structures in Four Modes of Writing at the Fourth Grade Level," 1973.

Donald H. Graves, University of New Hampshire, Durham, Department of Education. Research conducted at State University of New York, Buffalo, under the direction of Professor Walter Petty: "Children's Writing: Research Directions and Hypotheses Based Upon an Examination of the Writing Processes of Seven Year Old Children," 1974.

Appendix C

References for Further Research*

Summaries and Bibliographies

A "classic" source to consult for research in the twenties and before is Rollo L. Lyman's *Summary of Investigations Relating to Grammar, Language, and Composition*, published in 1929 as a Supplementary Educational Monograph by the University of Chicago. Lyman gave summaries of more than 250 studies and offered many excellent suggestions for the improvement of research. Periodic summaries or bibliographies published in the intervening period include the following:

Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Published at ten-year intervals. See entries on "English—Language, Grammar and Composition," "Spelling," "Handwriting," etc. Usually draws heavily from next item.

Review of Educational Research. Summary of research on English composition included approximately every three years. Tends to include published research rather than dissertations and theses. Journal.

Bibliography of Research Studies in Education. Bulletin publication of the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Annual.

Elementary English. Yearly reviews of published and unpublished studies of the preceding year. Journal.

Elementary School Journal. Yearly reviews of references on instruction in elementary school English. October issue.

English Journal. Yearly reviews of research in secondary English, prepared by the NCTE Committee on Research.

School Review. Yearly reviews of references on instruction in secondary school English. February issue. Journal.

Since 1950, a number of bibliographies and summaries have been published in addition to the many helpful bibliographies included with other books, articles, and unpublished manuscripts. Some titles are offered here:

Brown, Roger. *Words and Things*. New York: Macmillan (Free Press of Glencoe), 1958. 398p.

Burrows, Alvina T., *et al. Children's Writing: Research in Composition and Related Skills*. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1961. 73p.

_____. *What Research Says to the Teacher: Teaching Composition*. Washington: Department of Classroom Teachers and American Educational Research Association, National Education Association, 1959. 32p. Concerns elementary school children.

Carroll, John B. *The Study of Language*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953. 289p. Summarizes linguistic, sociological, and psychological studies of language.

Dawson, Mildred A. "Interrelationships between Speech and Other Language Arts Areas," *Elementary English*, XXXI (April, 1954), 223-233. Includes written communication.

Godwin, L. Ruth. "Studies Related to the Teaching of Written Composition," *Canadian Education and Research Digest*, III (March, 1963), 35-47.

*From R. Braddock, R. Lloyd-Jones, and L. Schoer, *Research in Written Composition* (Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1963), pp. 117-118.

Gray, William S. *The Teaching of Reading and Writing*. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1956. 281p. An international survey of world literacy problems with reference to methods of teaching.

Haugh, Oscar M. "Representative Research in the Communication Skills," *Education*, LXXII (March, 1952), 470-480.

Horn, Ernest. *What Research Says to the Teacher: Teaching Spelling*. Washington: Department of Classroom Teachers and American Educational Research Association, National Education Association, 1954. 32p.

Hunnicut, C. W., and William J. Iverson, eds. *Research in the Three R's*. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1958. 446p.

Hunt, Jacob T. "Selected Bibliography on Communication," *High School Journal*, XXXVII (January, 1954), 127-130.

Kraus, Silvy. *Teaching of Written Composition in the Public Schools: A Summary of Research*. Curriculum Bulletin, XV, 190. Eugene: University of Oregon, School of Education, 1959. 23p.

Leopold, Werner F. *Bibliography of Child Language*. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1952. 115p. Includes titles through 1946.

Meckel, Henry C. "Research on Teaching Composition and Literature," pp. 966-1006 in *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, ed. N. L. Gage. A Project of the American Educational Research Association, National Education Association. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1963.

Pavlak, Stephen E. "A Critical Analysis of Scientific Research in Spelling." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1956. 246p. UM 56-3826.

Russell, David H. "Interrelationships of the Language Arts and Personality," *Elementary English*, XXX (March, 1953), 167-180.

Sebeok, Thomas A., ed. *Style in Language*. New York: John Wiley, 1960. 470p.

Shane, Harold G. *Research Helps in Teaching the Language Arts*. Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, National Education Association, 1955. 80p.

Smith, Nila B., ed. *Areas of Research Interest in the Language Arts*. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1952. 36p. O.P.

Strom, Ingrid M. "Research in Grammar and Usage and Its Implications for Teaching Writing." *Bulletin of the School of Education*, Indiana University, XXXVI, 5 (September, 1960). 23p.

Indices and Abstracts

In addition to the specialized references listed above, the investigator may wish to consult more general sources which include references on written composition and allied topics. *Education Index* is, of course, an invaluable reference to magazine, journal, and bulletin articles. Far less overlapping with the above sources are the various indices to unpublished studies:

Dissertation Abstracts. Abstracts of all doctoral dissertations completed at the many American and Canadian universities which cooperate with University Microfilms. Dissertations of other universities are also listed, by author and subject, in *Index to American Doctoral Dissertations*, published annually as a supplement to *Doctoral Dissertations*.

Master's Theses in Education. Includes American and Canadian theses.

Research Studies in Education. Differs from the two above sources in that it includes studies in progress as well as studies completed.

Index to Theses Accepted for Higher Degrees in the Universities of Great Britain and Ireland. Includes dissertations and theses.